0-315-01109-2

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Division

Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

48967

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

- Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

DAVID JOHN McMASTER HIGGINS

Date of Birth — Date de naissance DECEMBER 5, 1955	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance ENGLAND

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

10
Poinciana Court Sherwood Park Alberta

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

The Coronation of Edward III

University — Université

University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Master of Arts

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade 1980	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse Dr. F.D. Blackley

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date October 10, 1980	Signature David Higgins

NL-91 (4/77)

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NL-339 (Rev. 8/80)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE CORONATION OF EDWARD III

by

© DAVID JOHN HIGGINS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1980

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Coronation of Edward III submitted by David John Higgins in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

F.D. Blackley
Supervisor

W.J. Jones

Date 24 Sept/80

ABSTRACT

The coronation of a medieval monarch was an extremely important occasion: without it he was not fully king. This thesis examines the coronation of one of England's greatest kings, Edward III, which took place on 1 February 1327. The events which led up to the coronation of Edward III are discussed first and then the preparations which were made for the ceremony of coronation and the banquet which followed are detailed. Finally, as far as is possible, the details of these two events are examined.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to acknowledge the generous help and assistance which Dr. F. D. Blackley has given during the preparation of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE
INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER

I THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND 2

II THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE CORONATION AND BANQUET 21

III THE CORONATION CEREMONY AND BANQUET 54

CONCLUSION 86

BIBLIOGRAPHY 90

APPENDIX I 96

APPENDIX II 102

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an examination of Edward III's coronation: the historical background, the preparations, and the coronation ceremony and banquet are discussed in turn.

A major source for this thesis is an unpublished counter-roll of the Great Wardrobe, which was basically the supply department of the king's Household. If spices were needed in the kitchen, wax for seals, or cloth for carpets and robes, the Great Wardrobe supplied them. This counter-roll gives a list of cloth purchased by the Great Wardrobe for the coronation and details about the cloth used in the decoration of Westminster Abbey and the palace at Westminster. A Latin transcription of this counter-roll appears in an appendix to this thesis.

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

On 24 September 1326 a small fleet of ten fishing boats carrying Queen Isabella, Roger Mortimer, and a small army of roughly 1500 men, of whom some 700 were Hainaulters, sailed into the port of Orwell in Suffolk. Their publicly announced objective was the destruction of the Despensers, the favourites of Edward II, although the outcome of the invasion was the removal of Edward II. The events which led up to this curious invasion are well known and beyond the scope of this thesis, but the invasion, and its success, form the political background to the coronation of Edward III.[1]

Edward II brought this invasion upon himself by his incompetence in the business of government, which caused a good deal of dissatisfaction and unrest, and by his inordinate patronage of favourites, particularly of the Despensers. Sir Hugh Despenser and his son, Hugh the younger, who were originally members of the middle ranks of the aristocracy, used their close association with the king to acquire illegally huge land holdings and in 1322 Hugh the elder was granted the earldom of Winchester by the king - an action which was considered a grave affront by members of the aristocracy. The activities of the Despensers aroused widespread fear and loathing not only against themselves, but also against the king, their patron. The Despensers also alienated queen Isabella; at least publicly she maintained that she was motivated by hatred of the Despensers and she certainly did dislike the younger Hugh.[2] Edward II's continued support of the Despensers, even in the face of Isabella's refusal to return from France while the Despensers remained in power, forced her into rebellion if she was to regain her position and thus she joined the exiled enemies of the Despensers and Edward. While in Paris Isabella became the mistress of one of the leading exiles, Roger Mortimer, a powerful Marcher lord who, in seeking to destroy the Despensers, had opposed Edward II.

The danger of Isabella's alliance with the exiles was increased by the presence of prince Edward, the heir-apparent, with her in Paris where he had been sent to offer homage to his uncle, Charles IV, for Gascony and Ponthieu. Thus the news of Isabella's refusal to return to England raised the spectre of an invasion by Isabella and the exiled English opponents of the king supported by the French. Rumours and speculation about the threatened invasion were rife throughout the south of England. Edward and the government were seriously alarmed while, on the other hand, the Contrariants - those men who had opposed Edward during the civil war of 1321-22 and who had stayed in England as outlaws - took heart and increased their activity.[3] As a result, the chaos in the country worsened and ineffectiveness of the government was clearly shown. The fears of Edward and the hopes of the Contrariants turned out to be well founded.

Contrary to the traditional interpretation, Dr. Natalie Fryde has shown that Isabella's position at the French court was a strong one.[4] Isabella's brother, Charles IV, far from being embarrassed by her relationship with Mortimer or seduced by English bribes, warmly supported her. Charles actively promoted prince Edward's engagement to Philippa, the count of Hainault's daughter, and he also loaned Isabella money. Philip de Valois, Isabella's cousin, was eager to remove any rivals in his claim to the throne, and thus favoured her invasion plans, the key to which was the marriage alliance with Philip's niece, Philippa of Hainault. Prince Edward's betrothal to Philippa achieved several things: Philippa's dowry provided much-needed money, her uncle John, a famous warrior, provided leadership, while her father the count supplied a small force and transportation. Any lingering doubts which the count might have had about the expedition were resolved in May 1326 when ill-feeling between Hainault and England came to a head and Edward II ordered retaliation against the Hainaulters. The expedition duly sailed from Dordrecht on 23 September.

During the spring and summer of 1326, Edward was busy trying to perfect his defence plans, plans which became even more necessary in the summer when war broke out between England and France over Gascony. The defence arrangements consisted of the appointment of various magnates and prelates to supervise and command the county levies. Many of the men thus appointed, however, had no reason to love Edward and the Despensers, and worse, many had good reasons to hate them. For example, Henry, the earl of Leicester, along with Hugh Despenser the elder, the earl of Winchester, was appointed to command the array of the northern and central Midlands. Henry took the first opportunity to desert Edward, who had executed his brother, and to sabotage Winchester's war efforts. This illustrates the basic problem of Edward's government: he was unable to find any powerful and reliable men who would serve him. Edward had allotted himself a special task in the defence of the realm. He was to "make his way towards the March of Wales to rouse the good and loyal men of that land . . . [to] punish the traitors . . ."; Edward was able to manage only the first part of this assignment, "one of the few parts of the plan which seemed to come to pass."[5] The utter unreality of Edward's defence arrangements, which typify his weak government, is clearly shown by Isabella's landing and subsequent success.

The inaction of the commander of the fleet guarding the eastern coast and the unwillingness of the sailors to fight "because of the great wrath they had towards Sir Hugh Despenser"[6] allowed Isabella to land unopposed. When the earl of Norfolk, the king's half-brother and the commander of the defences for the eastern counties, heard of Isabella's landing, he moved to join her. With Norfolk's defection any hope of quickly crushing the small rebel force vanished. The Contrariants and their relatives and those disaffected with the government flocked to Isabella. Only a few people seem to have been willing to fight for Edward. Dr. Fryde has found references only to a small band of sailors and two groups of shire levies from the southern counties and Wiltshire who seemed prepared to do so.[7] However, after receiving their wages they either disbanded or joined Isabella, for nothing further is heard of them.

After seeing the widespread support which Isabella was receiving and having failed to raise London on their own behalf, Edward and the Despensers fled westward. They reached Gloucester on 10 October and the next day sent summonses to Gruffydd Llwyd in North Wales and to Rhys ap Gruffydd in the South, the two Welsh lords who had so loyally supported Edward during the civil war of 1321-22. From Gloucester Hugh Despenser the elder moved on to Bristol, while his son and the king tried to raise the men of South Wales. However, they found no more support in the West than they had in London. For some unknown reason the expected help from Rhys ap Gruffydd failed to appear; Rhys certainly remained loyal since he ended up as an exile in Scotland. Sir Gruffydd Llwyd was unable to reach the king, probably because of the interference of Robert Power, the chamberlain of North Wales.[8]

When Isabella arrived at Bristol late in October, the burgesses gave her their whole-hearted support and yielded the city and Hugh the elder to her without even a token resistance. On October 27, with the merest semblance of legality, Hugh Despenser the elder, the earl of Winchester, was sentenced for manifest treason by a group of magnates to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. From Bristol Isabella moved to Hereford and sent the earl of Leicester in pursuit of Edward and Hugh Despenser the younger who, after their attempt to flee to Ireland from south-east Wales had failed owing to contrary winds, were wandering west of Caerphilly. On 16 November they were finally captured near Neath abbey. Edward was taken by the earl of Leicester to Kenilworth castle; Hugh the younger was dealt with in the same fashion as his father had been. A 'tribunal' gathered in Hereford on 24 November and the younger Despenser was condemned to a traitor's death by "*totes les bones gentz du Roialme, greindres et meindres, riches et poures, par commun assent*."[9]

Isabella and the rebels were understandably anxious to justify and explain their rebellion to the people of England. Soon after the landing, Adam Orleton, the bishop of Hereford, expounded Isabella's cause, the main element of which seems to have been the removal of the Despensers, to a group of assembled nobles. Letters of undoubtedly similar content were dispatched to London and other towns. But it was not until 15 October at Wallingford that a full-scale justification, which may have been drafted by John Stratford, the bishop of Winchester, was given. This document elaborated on the evil done to the church, the king, and the people by Hugh Despenser and explained that Isabella and her adherents had landed in England to remove, with the help of good men, the Despensers and to remedy the evils. Later on the removal of Edward II was justified by charging that, as all men knew, Edward II was no longer fit to rule because he was insufficient and, contrary to his oath, the destroyer of both the church and the peers of the realm, and a follower of evil counsel. This propaganda was obviously effective, since within a mere four weeks Edward II's rule had collapsed and Isabella had triumphed and within four months Edward II had been removed and Edward III crowned.[10]

The reason for the speed and ease of Isabella's success is not hard to find. The invasion of 24 September was a focal point and a spark for all manner of grievances from all levels of society. For example, many of the magnates and knights were angered and seriously alarmed by Edward's rapacious treatment of those who had opposed his regime, either because they were directly affected or because they feared that they might be similarly treated. As Dr. Fryde has shown, Edward's officials were eager to desert him largely because of the ill-treatment they received from him: they were badly overworked, the perquisites of their positions, which were an important source of income, were cut off, and their wages were paid in arrears.[11] The Londoners, high and low, were very suspicious and resentful of Edward because of the repressive way in which he had treated the city. Many of Edward's bishops and courtiers abandoned him. Even Edward's half-brother by his father's second wife, Thomas of Brotherton the earl of Norfolk, left him; his other half-brother, Edmund of Woodstock the earl of Kent, had joined Isabella earlier in Paris. Edward was powerless to resist such widespread and united opposition; his extreme "royalist solution to the problem of politics" had been soundly rejected.[12]

Indeed, towards the end of his reign Edward found it difficult to produce any solution to "the problem of politics"; he was increasingly unable to provide that important ingredient of medieval kingship - good government. His inability to find faithful servants, the dissatisfaction of the important local men with the government, and the growing activity of the Contrariants and other outlaws seriously weakened Edward's ability to rule, and led to increasing local disorder. They also hastened Edward's fall.

Initially Isabella's invasion served only to worsen the situation. London was the scene of mob violence and pillage as the citizens vented their anger on Walter Stapledon, the bishop of Exeter, who was Edward's treasurer, and on Edward's financiers, the Bardi. The behaviour of the rebel army was not any better. Any property belonging to their opponents which was within reach was soon looted. The king's two half-brothers, the earls of Norfolk and Kent, were particularly enterprising: twenty-three estates scattered across the country which belonged to the Despensers and the earl of Arundel, Edmund Fitzalan who was another firm supporter of Edward II, were plundered by their agents.[13] In such an atmosphere private feuds and old grievances soon erupted into violence.

It is against this background of growing anarchy that one must see the rebels' concern that they provide themselves with some air of legitimacy and legality. The trials of the Despensers by their peers and their conviction, in the absence of the king, by the process of notoriety illustrates this.

The day after Hugh Despenser the elder's execution, October 26, the magnates gathered in Bristol, after adopting the convenient fiction that the king had departed the kingdom leaving the realm without a ruler, asked prince Edward, who was only fourteen years old, to become the keeper of the kingdom, the _custos_. As an official memorandum records, "_sic quod idem dux et custos, nomine et jure ipsius domini regis, patris sui, ipso rege sic absente, dictum regnum regeret et gubernaret_."[14] The young duke's appointment gave the rebels the veneer of legality they sought to enable them to govern. Edward issued "writs in his father's name, witnessing and warranting them himself alone, or in conjunction with his mother."[15] Unfortunately the chancellor, Robert Baldock, had the great seal and he was with the king; so the young Edward's privy seal had to be used. It was under this seal and in the name of the king that writs for a parliament to be held on 14 December at Westminster were sent out. But the king and Baldock were still issuing writs under the great seal; their capture on 16 November brought this rather curious double government to an end. (The writs of both the king and the keeper were eventually enrolled in Chancery). The king's capture meant, moreover, that the expedient of designating the young Edward as custos was abandoned on 20 November 1326, and instead the king's personal government was held to have been resumed. Thus government was carried on by writs which were supposedly attested by the king. Of course it was a fiction and, significantly, the words "per ipsam reginam et filium regis primogenitum" were now often added to the king's formula of witness "teste me ipso" on writs.[16] Thus the rebels were able to issue writs in the king's name and under the great seal postponing parliament until 7 January.

It was through this assembly that the rebels hoped to solve their most pressing and obvious problem - how to remove Edward II, an anointed king, from the throne and install his son in his place. There was no precedent or established procedure for such a step, a grave one indeed for a king was God's anointed and the head of society. Some thinkers felt that men should not act against their king, who, if he would not remedy injustices himself, could be punished only by God. In the case of Edward, there existed the possibility of opposition to what the rebels wished to do from some of the bishops and, even more dangerous, the possibility of a reconciliation between the king and his son. Isabella and Mortimer "nervously felt their way, step by step, and hence arose the peculiarly tortuous and confused nature of the proceedings that followed."[17]

The assembly duly gathered at Westminster on 7 January. The writs for the 'parliament' were issued correctly and the composition of it was in no way extraordinary. Bishops, abbots, magnates, earls, and commons were all summoned. As Sir Goronwy Edwards's excellent article on the commons personnel under Edward I and Edward II clearly shows, the commons were well represented. At least thirty-five shires and thirty boroughs returned or sent members, giving a minimum of 130 commons representatives.[18] However, it has long been debated whether or not this assembly was a parliament, since the king himself was absent. Even the contemporaries were uncertain about the nature of this assembly. Some chroniclers, if simply because of its composition and location, called the assembly a parliament. Other more discriminating writers were careful either to avoid the word 'parliament' or to point out that the assembly gathered on the authority of the queen.[19] Furthermore there is no record of the events of this assembly in the parliamentary rolls and, as Dr. Wilkinson has pointed out, "there remains a clear possibility that it [the record] was omitted simply from doubt as to the nature of the assembly."[20] But as Professor May McKisack has said, ". . . whatever the legality or otherwise of the summons, it seems evident that before very long the assembly must resolve itself into a revolutionary convention."[21] A gathering whose sole concern was the removal of the king was not a parliament ~~for~~, in the contemporary sense, parliament was pre-eminently a royal occasion - constituted and called according to the king's will to aid in the business of government. Hence the doubt raised by the king's absence. Since this assembly was not properly a parliament, one must examine how and by what authority the king was in fact removed.

It has already been mentioned that the rebels were concerned that their actions at least have the appearance of legality. In order to have even a semblance of this legality, Edward's deposition required an important public occasion; the "parliament" due to meet on 7 January was the obvious choice.[22]

What exactly transpired at the assembly is difficult to say. The two most comprehensive accounts in the Historia Roffensis and the Chronicle of Lanercost are contradictory and sometimes confused, no doubt reflecting the actual proceedings.

According to the Historia Roffensis, Adam Orleton, the bishop of Hereford, informed the gathering that the queen could not return to the king because he would kill her. Orleton then asked the gathering whom they preferred to rule, the king or his son. The same question was asked on the following day and Tandem una voce omnium Filius in Regem sublimatur. Amid shouts of Ecce Rex vester the new king was led into the Great Hall at Westminster and received the oaths of homage due to him. Then archbishop Reynolds preached, followed by the bishops of Winchester and Hereford. The account in the Historia Roffensis concludes with a description of an oath in support of the liberties of the city of London which the citizens forced the bishops to swear.[23]

The correctness of this account has been rightly questioned by Dr. Wilkinson. He doubts whether such an important issue would have been rushed through in two days, particularly since medieval parliaments were seldom fully assembled on the first day. Furthermore, the statement that Edward received homage in the Great Hall on 8 January is extremely difficult to reconcile with the comprehensive account of later proceedings found in Lanercost chronicle. Dr. Wilkinson suggests that the business of the assembly - the removal of the king - may have been broached to the full gathering on the first day and then "more seriously discussed in the more restricted assembly of the lords."[24] The account of this assembly given in the Chronicle of Lanercost is more plausible.

Obviously Mortimer had to deal with the problem of the king's absence at the beginning of the session. The business of the assembly was the removal of the king, a semi-legal proceeding "at which Edward's presence would normally be expected,"[25] and it appears that those who favoured the king, notably the archbishop of York and the bishops of Carlisle, London, and Rochester, demanded his appearance. The upshot of this was, according to the Chronicle of Lanercost, the dispatch of two bishops, Stratford and Orleton to the king at Kenilworth to beg Edward

> humbly and urgently on the part of my lady the queen, her son, the Duke of Aquitaine, and all the earls, barons, and commonalty of the whole country assembled in London, that he would be pleased to come to the parliament to perform and enact with his lieges for the crown of England what ought to be done and what justice demanded.[26]

Although there are ample grounds on which to doubt the sincerity with which the bishops prosecuted their mission, Edward seems to have had no desire to appear in Westminster, "declaring that he would not come among his enemies - or rather, his traitors."[27] The two bishops returned to London and the assembly, which had not been meeting during their absence, reconvened on 13 January.

Our knowledge of the events of the next few days comes largely from the Lanercost chronicle, supplemented by an extract from an anonymous Canterbury chronicle. The latter source records that on 13 January Roger Mortimer announced to the assembly the decision and course of action which the magnates had determined at some previous meeting, possibly held at the beginning of the session or perhaps between the 7 and 13 of January.

> Therefore he [Mortimer] brought before the people what the magnates had thus unanimously agreed among themselves [namely] that the king, from now on, ought not to have the government of the kingdom because he was inadequate, the destroyer of the great men of the kingdom and the holy church against his oath and crown, [and] he was a follower of bad counsel. And

> therefore, his first born son, the duke of Aquitaine should rule in his stead, if the people would give assent.[28]

Thus the leaders of the new regime, with the support of the magnates, presented their decision, but for their decision to have any validity or effect wider support would have to be won. The ensuing events, then, can be seen as an attempt to gain broader acceptance and approval for the removal of the king, rather than as judgements by parliament or the nation.

After Mortimer's speech, Adam Orleton, the bishop of Hereford, gave an inflammatory sermon on a text from Ecclesiasticus - 'A foolish king shall ruin his people'; the response was enthusiastic - "et respondit omnis populus una voce: Nolumus hunc amplius regnare super nos."[29] A number of bishops, however, still opposed Mortimer's plans. And, according to Dr. Fryde, it was in order to overawe all such opposition that Mortimer determined to unite the turbulent and powerful Londoners with the new regime.[30] A deputation, in which the bishops were included, met the Londoners at the Guildhall and both parties swore an oath to uphold the cause of the queen and her son, and the liberties of the city. But, even faced with the hostility of the violent Londoners, the archbishop of York and the bishops of Carlisle and London refused to swear the oath. Hamo de Hethe, the bishop of Rochester, would take the oath only under protest, saving his order and Magna Carta. He had his protest and exceptions notarized.[31] Despite the brave stand of these prelates, Mortimer still had the firm support of the remaining ten bishops. Thus, out of twenty English and Welsh bishops, at least ten bishops supported the new regime, four opposed it, while the remaining six no doubt preferred to remain uninvolved. Of the fifty-four magnates who had been summoned to parliament, only twenty-eight swore the Guildhall oath.

The building-up of support for the magnates' decision to remove Edward II continued with at least two more sermons on successive days; on 14 January bishop Stratford preached on the text 'My head pains me' and the following day Walter Reynolds, the archbishop of Canterbury, expounded that famous phrase 'Vox populi, vox dei'. The archbishop ended his sermon by

> announcing to all his hearers that, by the unanimous consent of all the earls and barons, and of the archbishops bishops, and of the whole clergy and people, king Edward was deposed from his pristine dignity, never more to reign or to govern the people of England; and he added that all the above-mentioned, both laity and clergy, unanimously agreed that my lord Edward, his first-born son, should succeed his father in the kingdom.[32]

As Dr. Wilkinson has said,

> The nation [was] called upon to participate in the deposition of Edward II; but it was rather by accepting acts which were performed by the magnates, or a section of them, in its name, than by itself, either directly or through a representative committee, deposing the king.[33]

The day after the archbishop's sermon, 16 January, a formal deputation set out for Kenilworth to inform the king of his deposition. The deputation, which was led by Sir William Trussell, a leading Contrariant who had been in exile in Paris, included two earls, two barons, three bishops, two abbots, two priors, two justiciaries, two Dominicans, two Carmelites, four knights, two Londoners, and two barons of the Cinque Ports. This deputation was "a partisan body whose purpose was to show to Edward how much his removal was popularly desired."[34]

Although the sentence of deposition had been determined by the magnates and popularly acclaimed, the leaders of the regime were unsure if this would suffice "to wash the balm" from an anointed king. Some form of abdication obviously would suffice, and furthermore, it would enhance the legality of young Edward's accession. Indeed, some of the chroniclers say that the purpose of the deputation was to get Edward to abdicate since his son refused to accept the crown if his father was not willing.[35]

The chronicle of Galfridus de Swynebroke explains how this 'abdication' was achieved. Two of the bishops, Winchester and Lincoln, going to Kenilworth preceded the main deputation and, along with Edward's keeper, the earl of Leicester, sought to persuade him to abdicate. His reluctance to do so was overcome by threatening him with the exclusion of his son from the throne and the election of a non-royal candidate, presumably Mortimer. Thus by the time the main deputation had arrived, Edward had been coerced into abdicating. The same chronicle records the meeting between Edward and the deputation. Clothed in a black gown, Edward came forth to meet the deputation from an inner chamber. He was overcome by the gravity of the situation and he fell headlong in a dead faint. Once Edward had recovered his senses, bishop Adam Orleton formally explained the reason for the deputation's arrival. He suggested that Edward resign the crown to his son or, once he himself had been repudiated, the people would choose someone else, not of the royal line, for king. Once he had heard this, Edward replied _cum fletu et eiulate_ that, although the anger of his people against him grieved him deeply, he thought it best that his son succeed him since the people had obviously accepted him as king.[36]

The next day Sir William Trussell, as _procurator praelatorum comitum, et baronum, et aliorum in procuratorio meo nominatorum_[37] renounced the homage and allegiance due to the king, and Sir Thomas Blount, the seneschal of the royal household, broke his staff of office, thus dissolving the household. The deputation then returned to London to report to the assembly. The following day, 25 January, was the official beginning of Edward III's reign.

Thus, with a semblance of legality, Edward II was removed from the throne of England through a combination of deposition and abdication. But in order to complete the rebellion and the succession, Edward III had to be crowned.

Even though Edward III was king, he was still a minor, and a regency council was appointed to guide him. As the greatest magnate in the realm and the king's cousin, Henry of Lancaster was the head of this council. However, Lancaster's position as the king's chief councillor was gradually usurped by Roger Mortimer, who derived enormous power from his position in the royal family, and his access to the king was restricted. The Scalacronica notes that "Edward the Third . . . was in all things, governed, and his realm also, by his mother and by Roger Mortimer."[38]

The rule of Isabella and Mortimer became increasingly unpopular. They proved incapable of meeting the Scots in the field and the treaty of Northampton (1328) which they concluded with Robert the Bruce became known as "the shameful peace" because it abandoned the English claims in Scotland. The earl of Norfolk, Edward II's half-brother, seems to have been involved in a squabble with Mortimer over his rights as Earl Marshal during the summer of 1327. Lancaster's anger over his exclusion from real power and his disgust at Mortimer's new title of earl of March, led him to stage an armed demonstration before the king in October 1328 in an attempt to convince "the king of the serious discontent that Mortimer and his other advisors were arousing."[39] This effort failed and civil war threatened until Lancaster submitted. Finally, early in 1330 the earl of Kent, Edward II's half-brother, and others who disbelieved the official announcement of Edward II's convenient death in September

1327 plotted to restore the deposed monarch to his throne. Mortimer got wind of the plot and quickly arrested Kent and executed him on 19 March.

It has been suggested that the murder of the earl of Kent, whom Edward III seems to have liked, served as a warning to the young king that "to Mortimer nobody, however near the king, was sacred."[40] Whatever the case, Edward III, with the aid of William Montague, a member of his Household, plotted to overthrow Mortimer. On 19 October 1330 a group of knights entered Nottingham castle via a secret passage and surprised Mortimer. He was taken to London where, a few weeks later, he was condemned in parliament on the grounds of notoriety to a traitor's death. Isabella was initially kept under supervision, but she was soon granted a generous allowance which enabled her to pass a happy retirement moving about her estates until her death in 1358. The earl of Norfolk survived to serve the king until he died in 1338.

With the capture of Mortimer Edward III began his independant rule. It was a period of unprecedented domestic harmony: Edward III was uniquely able to placate and unite the magnates in support of the crown and thus was able to prosecute his claim to the French throne. His reign proved to be one of the most successful of any medieval monarch.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Dr. Fryde has reconsidered in detail the overthrow of Edward II. See Natalie Fryde, The tyranny and fall of Edward II, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

2. Dr. F. D. Blackley has shown that Isabella had a long-standing dislike of Hugh Despenser the younger and that she refused to return to England "For danger and doubt of Hugh le Despenser." See F. D. Blackley, "Isabella and the Bishop Exeter" in Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson, ed. by R. A. Sandquist and M. R. Powicke (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), pp. 224-26.

3. The civil war of 1321-22 culminated in the battle of Boroughbridge after which many of the Contratiants were either killed or imprisoned, while a few of them managed to flee abroad. See Fryde, The tyranny and fall of Edward II, chap. 11 passim; p. 176.

4. Ibid., pp. 181-82.

5. Ibid., p. 184.

6. M. McKisack, The Fourteenth Century (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 83.

7. Fryde, The tyranny and fall of Edward II, pp. 188-89.

8. Ibid., pp. 189-90.

9. McKisack, The Fourteenth Century, p. 87.

10. Fryde, The tyranny and fall of Edward II, pp. 186-88, 195 197-98, 233.

11. Ibid., pp. 100-101.

12. Bertie Wilkinson, The Later Middle Ages in England (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1969), p. 130.

13. Fryde, The tyranny and fall of Edward II, p. 194.

14. S. B. Chrimes and A. L. Brown, eds., Select Documents of English Constitutional History 1307-1485 (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1961), p. 33.

15. T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, 6 vols. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1920-33), 3:1.

16. Ibid., p. 1 n.2.

17. Fryde, *The tyranny and fall of Edward II*, p. 196.

18. J. G. Edwards, "The Personnel of the Commons in Parliament under Edward I and Edward II," in *Historical Studies of the English Parliament*, 2 vols. ed. by E. B. Fryde and E. Miller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 1:150-67.

19. For a brief discussion of this debate, see Bertie Wilkinson, "The Deposition of Richard II and the Accession of Henry IV," *English Historical Review* 54 (1939): 223-25.

20. Ibid., p. 225 n. 1.

21. McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century*, p. 91.

22. Fryde, *The tyranny and fall of Edward II*, p. 195.

23. William Dene, "Historia Roffensis," in *Anglia Sacra*, ed. H. Wharton, 2 Vols. (London 1961), 1:367.

24. Wilkinson, "The Deposition of Richard II," p. 225 n.4.

25. Ibid.

26. *The Chronicle of Lanercost*, trans. Sir Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons, 1913), p. 254.

27. Ibid.

28. This anonymous chronicle from Canterbury has been published in appendix no. 2 of Fryde, *The tyranny and fall of Edward II*, pp. 233-35.

29. *The Chronicle of Lanercost*, p. 254. Wilkinson, "The Deposition of Richard II," p. 225 n. 4.

30. Fryde, *The tyranny and fall of Edward II*, p. 198.

31. R. M. Haines, *The Church and Politics in Fourteenth Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 172; K. Edwards, "The Political Importance of the English Bishops during the reign of Edward II," *English Historical Review* 49 (1944): 344, n. 5.

32. *The Chronicle of Lanercost*, p. 255. The leaders of the new regime employed other means of influencing public opinion beside speeches. According to Joshua Barnes' biography of Edward III, a special coronation medal was made to be "flung among

2

the People." The reverse of the medal showed "a Hand held forth, as it were saving a Crown falling from on high with these words - *Non rapit sed recepit*." The obverse presented the "Young Prince Crowned, laying a Sceptre on a heap of Hearts, with this Motto - *Populo dat jura volenti*." See Joshua Barnes, *History of Edward III*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1688), 1:4.

33. Wilkinson, "The deposition of Richard II," p. 224.

34. Fryde, *The tyranny and fall of Edward II*, p. 199.

35. *Edwardus quoque, filius suus, materno dolori compassus, juravit quod invito patre nunquam susciperet coronam regni. Idcirco, communi decreto, ex parte totius regni, tres Episcopi, duo comites . . . missi sunt ad Regem apud Kenelworth*. (*Historia Anglicana*, of Thomas Walsingham, ed. H. T. Riley, 2 vols. Rolls Series [London, 1863], 1:186). ". . . and then Edward, hir son, mad his avow to God that he schuld nevir take the crown with oute his fader consent.

Than, be the decre of the Parlement, thei sent to the kyng 2 bischcoppis, 2 herlis . . ." *The Chronicle of England*, of John Capgrave, ed. F. C. Hingeston, Rolls Series (London, 1858), p. 197.

36. *Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynbroke*, ed. E. M. Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), pp. 27-28.

37. Wilkinson, "The Deposition of Richard II," p. 227.

38. *The Scalacronica of Sir Thomas Grey*, translated by Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons, 1907), p.79.

39. Fryde. *The tyranny and fall of Edward II*, p. 221.

40. Ibid., p. 225.

CHAPTER II

THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE CORONATION AND BANQUET

Information about the coronation of Edward III is scarce. The chroniclers have little to say beyond giving the date and place of the coronation; some of them even give the wrong date. The following extract from Ranulf Higden's Polychronicon, a fairly reliable general history which was copied by several other chroniclers, is typical.

> Edwardus filius Edwardi, post conquestum tertius, adolescens quindecim annorum circiter, vivente adhuc patre sub custodia, in festo purificiationis beatae Mariae coronatus est in regem apud Westmonasterium. In cuius primordiis grata suggebantur auspicia, nam et tunc terra recepit ubertatem, aer temperiem, mare tranquillitatem, ecclesia libertatem.[1]

As will be shown, the continuation of the Annales prioratus de Dunstapalia, however, does preserve some unique and useful information about the expenses of the coronation.[2] But, on the whole, the chronicles are of only limited use.

Little information on the coronation is found in the various printed calendars of documents and in Foedera. The only document of note is a memorandum which, in addition to giving the date, the place, and the officiant of the coronation, records which bishops and magnates were present and the oath which the king swore.[3] There is some valuable information about the coronation scattered among such government records as writs of privy seal, household books, and various indentures and financial documents, notably a counter-roll of the Great Wardrobe dealing with cloth purchased for the coronation.[4] It is, however, very incomplete and difficult to assemble.

This dearth of information is doubtless the reason for the obsurity and neglect in which Edward III's coronation has languished. Joshua Barnes, whose History of Edward III, published in 1688, is still the best biography of Edward, confined himself to noting where, when, and by whom Edward was crowned. In a somewhat slighting fashion he wrote,

> I do not think it necessary to make any exact narration of the coronation of this young monarch; because such things are so well known in general; and others, who delight in matters of less moment, have not omitted a full description thereof . . . .[5]

Unfortunately, I have not been able to find the detailed accounts of the coronation to which Mr. Barnes referred in such a tantalising fashion. Neither presumably could Mr. J. H. Round, an industrious historian, who says "We know hardly anything of this [Edward III's] coronation."[6] W. Warburton in his biography Edward III (1902) does not even give the date of the coronation, which is only mentioned in passing.[7] The most recent biographer of Edward III (1973), Paul Johnson, is equally brief.[8] Finally, P. E. Schramm, the great authority on the English coronation, is primarily concerned with the constitutional aspects of the ceremony.[9]

A king's coronation was the most solemn and perhaps the most important occasion in his life; without it he was not fully king. Every aspect of the ceremony was charged with symbolism showing the position of the king before God and the people, the interpretation of which came more readily to medieval man than it does to modern man.[10] The anointing with holy oil showed the king's sacred character; the rich coronation robes showed the splendour and majesty of the king; and the participation of the great men of the land showed his power and might. It was above all a splendid occasion, an opportunity for display.

The coronation of Edward III had to be spectacular, one would think, in order to dispel any lingering doubts about the legitimacy of the new regime. A great spectacle, however, is always expensive. Quite apart from the cost of the material involved, those who participated in the ceremony had to be paid their fees. The coronation feast alone was very costly. The total cost of the ceremony and the attendant festival is impossible to determine. Comparisons with the coronations of other kings are thus very difficult.

There is no obvious reason why Edward III's coronation should not have been spectacular. It seems that both Isabella and Mortimer had a taste for ostentatious display. Isabella held a magnificent Christmas celebration (1326) at Wallingford, and she seems to have enjoyed giving expensive New Year's presents.[11] She also gave costly gifts to the Hainaulters who were returning home.[12] In late spring 1328 Mortimer celebrated the marriage of his daughters with a magnificent tournament in Hereford at which Isabella and the king were present.[13] Later in the same year he held a Round Table at Bedford.[14] The _Chronica monasterii de Melsa_ refers to him as _in magnificentia perduravit_.[15] Although Isabella and Mortimer were greedy for money, they had no aversion to spending it.

There were certainly amply amounts of money to spend. Edward II became obsessively greedy and miserly in the last years of his reign and all manner of oppressive schemes to increase the royal revenue were implemented. These schemes, chief of which was the exploitation of Contrariant lands, have been ably examined by Dr. Fryde.[16] The new government benefited greatly from Edward II's colossal greed: the contents of the two treasuries at Westminster and the Tower of London totalled £61,921 4s. 9½d.[17] The grand total, however, was far higher, for there is no record of chamber receipts or of the fate of the large sums of money which Edward II had with him.[18] Isabella and Mortimer, however, were able to dissipate Edward II's huge fortune at an alarming rate, but there was still plenty of money in January 1327 with which to finance a lavish and spectacular coronation.[19]

Such a ceremony would normally require lengthy and involved preparations. The ordo, or form, of the service and the royal oath had to be determined;[20] both Westminster Abbey and the king's Great Hall had to be decorated; the people taking part in the ceremony needed to be briefed; and all the numerous items of clothing, furnishings, equipment, and food had to be supplied. Not only did the ceremony itself entail intensive preparation, but the festivities which were celebrated in conjuction with a coronation also required detailed planning. Mr. H. M. Colvin's description of some of the preparations for Edward II's coronation which involved the clerk of the works shows very clearly the degree of preparation which a medieval coronation could entail. He notes that

> . . . there were the temporary buildings which were required only on the day of the coronation. Chief among these was the great timber hall which was built for the ceremony of the king's enthronement . . . . The throne itself was repaired, and above it in an arch there stood a statue of a king cast in copper and gilded. This 'strong and solemn' hall was supplemented by no fewer than fourteen lesser ones . . . . In addition two of the buildings made by Edward I . . . were dismantled and re-erected near the door of the great hall to serve as a scullery and salsary. Forty ovens were constructed to cook the coronation banquet, and every vacant space in the palace and the nearby abbey was filled with forms, trestles and tables. Somewhere in the middle of the timber halls was the greatest wonder of all - a fountain flowing day and night with red and white wine and the spice drink known as pimento . . . . Over in the abbey church the carpenters were busy erecting the staging for the coronation ceremony itself. It stood in the middle of choir, and on it were the chairs in which the king and queen would be crowned. So lofty was this staging that men-at-arms could ride on horseback beneath it without stooping.[21]

Even a less ostentatious display would have required an enormous amount of planning and preparation.

One might reasonably presume, then, that planning for Edward III's coronation took some time. Since his father, Edward II, did not abdicate until 20 January 1327, and his coronation took place on the following 1 February, planning had to commence before the abdication took place. Writs in the name of Edward II for a parliament to be held on 14 December to deal with the crisis were issued on 28 October, but Edward II was still free and as long as he remained free the efficacy of any action was uncertain.[22] However, Edward II was captured on 16 November and his fate, if not the manner of that fate, was sealed. Parliament was postponed on 3 December to meet on the following 7 January. After 16 November, Isabella and Mortimer would be in a position to begin preparations for the coronation of young Edward.

Unfortunately there is no evidence which pinpoints when the preparations were in fact begun. The Household Book for 1-2 Edward III, however, does give some information, Under the heading _Recepta_ there is an entry recording money received _Per manus Ade de Bridlington clerici coquine super prouidentia officii sui pacta contra coronacionem regis ibidem secundem die ianuarii £100_; on 7 January Bridlington received a further £200 _super eadem prouidentia_.[23] None of the material for the coronation which is mentioned in a counter-roll of coronation expenses was purchased by the Great Wardrobe before January.[24]

Although we have no evidence for coronation preparation earlier than 2 January, common sense would indicate that some sort of action had to be taken much earlier. It should be noted that the arrangements for the food probably did not have a high priority; Edward II did not order the food for his coronation banquet, which was held on 25 February, until 10 January, long after other preparations had been taken in hand.[25]

Even if preparations were in fact begun in November, with some two months until the coronation, one would suppose that the preparations for it still must have been rushed. Any major public preparations, such as the decorating of Westminster Abbey and the hearing of claims to perform services, would presumably have had to wait until the deputation had returned from Kenilworth with news of Edward II's resignation and the coronation had been publicly announced. Joshua Barnes wrote that,

> . . . he [Edward III] being on 25 January proclaimed king of England . . . . Proclamations were issued in his Name, declaring to the People, that his Father the late King had made a Voluntary and free Resignation of his Regal Dignity to him, as being his Eldest Son.[26]

On 29 January Edward III published his peace, informing the sheriffs of his father's voluntary abdication, his own succession, and his desire and willingness to deal justly with his subjects.[27] The Chronicle of Lanercost simply states that,

> Meanwhile public proclamation was made in the city of London that my Lord Edward, son of the late king, was to be crowned at Westminster upon Sunday, being the vigil of the Purification of the Glorious Virgin, and that he would there assume the diadem of the realm.[28]

This proclamation was issued on 24 January.[29] The Chronica Monasterii de Melsa, says,

> Dies . . . coronationis dicti Edwardi filii praefixus est, ut omnes qui servitium aut fidelitatem regi deberent ad ipsum diem Londoniis convenirent.[30]

This statement implies that the coronation day was widely announced, not just in London as the Lanercost Chronicle says. There is, however, no further evidence surviving which suggests that the day of the coronation received wide announcement. Normally writs summoning important people to attend a coronation were issued, but none survived for this coronation, if in fact any were sent. The shortness of time and the presence in

London for parliament of the majority of those powerful men who would usually attend a coronation may have rendered such writs superfluous. Whatever the case, any preparations depending on the announcement of the coronation must have been extremely hurried.

The formal announcement of the coronation presumably would have opened the way for the presentation of claims to perform services at the coronation ceremony and at the feast. The record of such claims certainly bears out the supposition that the preparations were hurried. John de Burdeleys did not present his claim to be the larderer until 30 January. The claims to be the usher of the pantry and the king's champion were not heard in Chancery until 31 January. The inference is that the claims could not have been entered any earlier.[31] Decisions, however, must obviously have been made, perhaps informally, before the coronation.

These services were an integral and vital part of both the coronation and the banquet. The various items of the regalia which were used during the ceremony itself had to be carried from the palace to the abbey and, at the banquet, a basin and towel were to be presented for the king to wash. It was naturally counted a great honour to perform one of these services; hence many of them were disputed. Therefore, the decisions as to who would fulfill these services were a very necessary preliminary to the coronation. Unfortunately such decisions were far from straightforward.

The basis of most claims to perform services was the tenure of certain lands. The right to perform some services, however, was hereditary. A judgement involving questions of inheritance and land tenure could obviously be very complex. In some cases the records of the Exchequer had to be consulted - a slow procedure which was of little use in the hurried circumstances of Edward III's coronation.

At least one of the claims in 1327, however, was sent to the Exchequer for verification.[32] Robert de Mohaut disputed the right to be the chief butler with Adam de Clifton. Each claim was based on the possession of certain manors in Norfolk which, so it was maintained, were held per seruicium essendi pincerna . . . regum Anglie diebus coronacionum ipsorum regum.[33] These manors, Buckenham, Wymondham, Kenninghall, and Snetesham were all formerly held by Hugh d'Aubuigny, earl of Arundel (d. 1243), by serjeanty of butlery. On his death, the manors of Buckenham and Wymondham passed to his senior heir, Robert Tattershall, while the other two were inherited by the junior co-heir, a member of the Mohaut family. Adam de Clifton was the representative of the senior Tattershall line. The Exchequer was asked to determine "what manors, lands, and tenements were burdened with the service [of butlery] and who now held those manors and how and by what right they held them." The Exchequer's reply did little to solve the difficulty. It simply confirmed that the heirs of Robert Tattershall did in fact hold the manors of Buckenham and Wymondham by serjeanty of butlery and that Robert de Mohaut held the manor of Kenninghall by similar service; the Exchequer clerks were not able to find any information about the manor of Snetesham. Moreover the reply was not sent until 12 February.[34]

This disputed claim illustrates two further points about the petitions to serve at the 1327 coronation. Robert de Mohaut presented his petition to the king in parliament - coram nobis et consilio nostro in presenti parliamento nostro. Several other claimants, however, took their petitions to Chancery; as the enrolment of Adam de Clifton's petition says, "Adam de Clyfton', consanguineus et heres Thome de Caylly, venit in cancellaria regis apud Westmonasterium tricesimo die Ianuarii . . . et clamat . . . ."[35] These two different methods of presentation would suggest a lack of set procedure which was perhaps characteristic.

The king's will seems to have been crucial in deciding a disputed service. In the case of the chief butlership, Adam de Clifton, as heir of the senior line and holder of the chief manor of the former d'Aubigny estates, would seem to have the better claim. Admittedly Adam was a minor, but this would not have automatically excluded his claim. In 1377 at Richard II's coronation, Robert de Vere the earl of Oxford, although he was a minor, was allowed by the king's grace to fulfill the office of chamberlain himself.[36] In other cases a deputy, usually nominated by the claimant and acceptable to the king, performed the service. Robert de Mohaut's petition, however, was heard by the king, and it was the king who ordered the Exchequer records to be searched. In fact the record search seems to have been something of a formality, for in his order to the Exchequer on 29 January the king wrote, "Volumus ipsum Robertum ad seruicium predictum ad instantem coronacionem nostram faciendum admitti iubere . . . ."[37] The lateness of the Exchequer's reply simply reinforces this suggestion. Of course in the circumstances of 1327 one wonders just how active a role Edward III played in such decisions. At any rate, Robert de Mohaut almost certainly performed the service of chief butler on the king's coronation day.

At least two other services were disputed. Henry Hillary claimed the right to be the king's champion because of his tenure of the manor of Scrivelsby. Hillary's rival, Baldwin de Freville, claimed by right of the castle of Tamworth.[38] Both Tamworth and Scrivelsby were once held by Sir Robert Marmion, a former champion; Freville holding Tamworth represented the senior line of descendants, while Hillary with Scrivelsby was heir of the junior line. But according to J. H. Round there is no record of any fiefs being held by service of the king's champion before Edward III.[39] Whatever the truth of these claims, Henry Hillary certainly performed the service, since "*Baldwynus de Freuill' . . . in eadem cancellaria constitutus recognouit se nullum ius habere in predicto clameo seu seruicio . . . .*" perhaps because of some arrangement with Hillary. There is a surviving writ of privy seal dated 3 February which initiated payment of Hillary's fee.[40]

The other disputed service, that of the chief larderer, has a rather curious feature. According to the enrolment of coronation claims, on 30 January,

> *Iohannes filius et heres Galfridi de Burdeleys venit in dicta cancellaria apud locum predictum et clamat tenere manerium de Sculton' de dicto domino rege in capite, per homagium et per paruam seriantiam essendi lardinarius de feodo ad coronacionem . . .*

The rival claim was not submitted until 4 February by Robert Selyman and his wife Joan. It was based on the possession of other manors. Drs. Sayles and Richardson have advanced the plausible suggestion that Selyman submitted the claim simply to forestall any challenge to his title to his lands which he must have held by a similar petty serjeanty.[41] But the fact that the claim was presented late and presumably not allowed could have weakened that title. Still, it is difficult to imagine any other reason for the late submission. It seems likely, then, that John de Burdeleys was the chief larderer at Edward III's coronation. It should be noted that the petition to perform this service in 1377 mistakenly names Geoffrey Burdeleys, John's father, as chief larderer in 1327.[42]

The enrolment of coronation claims records one more petition, that of John Daubeney, who, on 31 January, claimed the honour of being the chief usher of the pantry and larder by right of certain tenements which he held.[43] Since there is no record of a rival claim, one may reasonably assume that Daubeney was the usher.

Of course many other petitions, which have not survived, must have been presented, simply because there were many more services which had to be performed. Our knowledge of those who submitted such petitions and fulfilled various services, although very limited, is somewhat extended by the Household book of 1-2 Edward III which records the payment of fees to those who served at the coronation.[44] Thomas le Wake, the earl of Lancaster's son-in-law, who had vocally demanded Edward II's deposition in the 7 January assembly, was the pantler. The earl of Oxford's son, Thomas de Vere, was the chamberlain, while the earl of Lancaster was the steward. The mayor of London served with the chief butler.

There were of course many other preparations which had to wait at least until Edward had been acclaimed by the assembly and which would have been equally rushed. The preparation of the abbey church and the king's palace at Westminster would have involved a certain amount of construction which was fairly time-consuming. There is an interesting entry about this matter in the Close Rolls.

> 21 January Kenilworth 1327
> To the sheriff of Middlesex. Order to cause all carpenters of his baliwick to come to Westminster immediately upon sight of the presents, so that they shall be there on the coming Friday, [23 January] to do certain works to be enjoined upon them on the king's behalf.
> The like to the sheriffs of Surrey and Sussex, Essex and Hertford.
> To the sheriff of Essex and Hertford. Order to cause 12 carts to come to Westminster immediately upon sight of the presents, to carry sand and other necessaires for the works within the king's palace of Westminster.[45]

This entry is dated 21 January, a mere ten days before the coronation. Since one must allow a number of days for the carpenters and carts to be collected and for them to get to Westminster, it seems unrealistic to expect them to arrive two days after the order was issued. No doubt construction continued until the last possible minute.

The purchase and collection of the various materials which were to be used in the preparations at Westminster, however, as have been seen, began some time before the public announcement of the coronation. In providing this material, the Great Wardrobe, as the "supply depot" of the Household, played a vital role. Invaluable information about these preparations is found in the counter-roll of the Great Wardrobe which has already been referred to; the Household book is also useful.[46] But, for the most part, details of the preparations can only be inferred from what actually happened at the ceremony and banquet.

The grants, recorded in the Household book, totalling £300 to Adam de Bridlington, clerk of the kitchen, to provide food for the coronation have already been mentioned. Unfortunately, there is little more information about the banquet preparations available. The continuation of the *Annales prioratus de Dunstaplia*, however, gives the following list of coronation expenses.

Panetria	45 .li.	17 .s.	6 .d.
Boteleria	188 .li.	14 .s.	8¼ .d.
Coquina et polteria	584 .li.	10 .s.	4 .d.
Salteria et saleria	215 .li.	0 .s.	0 .d.
Magna garderobe	1367 .li.	5 .s.	7½ .d.
Privata garderobe	216 .li.	18 .s.	5¾ .d.
Aula et camera	20 .li.	1 .s.	1 .d.

Stabulum - - - - - - - - - - -	13 .li.	8 .s.	3¼ .d.
Vadia - - - - - - - - - - - -	4 .li.	10 .s.	3 .d.
Item pro halis faciendis in toto - - - - -	179 .li.	12 .s.	0 .d.
Summa totalis - - - - - - - -	2835 .li.	18 .s.	2½ .d.[47]

Judging from the first four entries alone, some £1034 2 .s. 6¼ .d. were spent on the banquet - roughly one-third of the total expenses, a large proportion. One must, however, be careful about these figures. The *Annales prioratus de Dunstapalia* proper actually ends in 1297; the continuation consists of "several entries made at different times on the blank leaves of the volume, evidently written contemporaneously with the events described."[48] Obviously one wonders how this list of coronation expenses, the last thing one would expect to find in monastic annals, came to appear in the Dunstaple annals. The reliability of the list, coming from such an odd source, must therefore be questioned.[49] Nevertheless, it is difficult to imagine that the list is totally spurious, and, in the absence of any more trustworthy document, it must suffice.

The total of £1034 2 .s. 6¼ .d. was a very large amount of money to spend on provisions for a banquet. According to various entries in the memoranda roll of the Pells, some £960 were spent on provisions for Edward II's banquet.[50] Although it is difficult to equate these figures, they do suggest that Edward III's coronation banquet was at least as costly as his father's.

A few of the entries from the memoranda rolls relating to Edward II's banquet give an idea of the kind of purchases which were probably also made for Edward III's coronation banquet.

> 6th January, £100 paid to Adam Wade, Thomas de Wrothan, . . . corn chandlers, of London, chosen by the mayor and sheriffs of London to provide corn for the coronation --- On the same day

> £40 paid to Nicholas Picot and Nigell Dryry, Sheriffs of London, to provide beer for the said coronation. --- 9th January, £100 paid to Ralph Ratespray and Nicholas Doreman, merchants, of London, to provide large cattle and boars for the coronation. --- On the 11th of January, £200 paid to Thomas Brun, poulterer, of London, chosen by the mayor and sheriffs of London to provide poultry for the coronation of the Lord the King. --- On the 12th day of January, £100 paid to Adam de Foleham, of London, to provide fish for the coronation.[51]

Also, at least 1,000 tuns of good wine were ordered for Edward II's banquet.[52]

The collection of such large amounts of food and drink was undoubtedly something of a problem. At previous coronations, in addition to dealing with private suppliers, those in charge sent writs to various sheriffs ordering them to produce certain provisions, and writs of aid were given to royal purveyors. Edward I ordered several of his sheriffs to supply some 380 head of cattle, 430 sheep, 450 pigs, 18 wild boars, 278 flitches of bacon, and some 20,000 capons and fowls.[53] If such writs were sent out for Edward III's coronation banquet, they have not survived. It is possible that, owing to the shortage of time, no writs were sent and the local supplies and efforts of private provisioners had to suffice.[54]

Quite apart from the provision of food for the banquet there were other preparations which had to be made. Large numbers of cups, plates, and knives had to be found; the hall at Westminster had to be readied and decorated; and the necessary staff had to be organized. Again, a memoranda roll entry concerning Edward II's banquet provides a useful illustration:

> On the 12th of January, £20 paid to John le Disher, to provide plates, dishes, and saltsellers, for the coronation.[55]

There is, unfortunately, no similar entry for Edward III's banquet. There is, however, an interesting entry in the Close Rolls which may relate to the coronation banquet.

> 21 January Kenilworth 1327
> To the sheriff of Surrey. Order to cause 60 cartloads of heather to come to Westminster immediately upon sight of the presents, for the execution therewith of certain of the king's works.
> The like to the sheriff of Middlesex for 40 cartloads.[56]

The heather, presumably dried, could have been used to cover the floor of the Great Hall during the banquet; the strong aroma of the heather probably would have been very welcome.

The counter-roll of the Great Wardrobe also gives some useful information about the decoration of Westminster Hall where the banquet was held.[57] The interpretation of it, however, is not straightforward. The following _titulus_ appears in the second part of the counter-roll; _pro magna aula Wesmonaster' [et] pedibus regis et hala ibidem_. Under this heading these entries appear:

> Of cloth of Candlewikstret' for the 'curtains' and bench-covers for the great hall of the king at Westminster on the day of the king's coronation in the same year - - - - - - 7 cloths and 12 ells.
>
> On the same day for the king's halls there, of similar cloth - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 60 ells.
>
> On the same day for the gutters of the halls, of canvas - - - - - - - - - - - - - 300 ells.

The first entry is reasonably clear, although there is some uncertainty about the meaning of 'curtains' in this context. The word used in the manuscript is _dorsorium_, for which R. E. Latham's _Revised Medieval Latin Word-List_[58] gives the meaning 'dossal', curtain. Presumably some sort of hanging along the walls is meant, but, if such is the case, the word _tapetum_, which means tapestry of hanging, would be more usual. The second entry, unfortunately, does not specify the use of the sixty ells. It is difficult to say just how the 300 ells of canvas in the third entry, which were supplied for the gutters, were used. The Word-List simply suggests 'a channel'. Judging from a memorandum of 1311 about the repair of the Great Hall, a 'gutter' is a type of drain or sewer. "Item de omnibus gutteris & aqueductibus que ascendunt in palacium de Tamisia ad coquinas garderobas pro evacuacionibus earundem."[59] Perhaps these were simply temporary gutters made of canvas; on the other hand the canvas might have been used to cover existing gutters. The counter-roll records that the cloth of Candlewikstreet, which was cheap low-quality material, was bought in London from Roger de Wynton sometime in January.

The last two of the above counter-roll entries both refer to more than one hall; likewise the titulus mentions the "great hall at Westminster and . . . the hall there." Just what this second hall was used for is unclear. It seems to have been the custom that, early in the morning of the coronation day, the king was seated on a high chair. At Edward II's coronation this custom was followed in parua aula apud Westmonaserium.[60] However, the ordo which was probably followed in 1327 does not mention this custom. But a medieval ordo was not exhaustive in its description and, since Edward II and Richard II both followed this custom, it seems reasonable to assume that Edward III did so too. The second hall mentioned in the counter-roll was perhaps used for this purpose. This second hall was probably the lesser hall, the parua aula, or White Hall as it was also known. This hall, which had been decorated in 1324 with scenes from the life of Edward I, possibly including one of his coronation, stood directly south of the Great Hall, to which it was connected by a short passage. It is interesting to note that at the Christmas crown-wearing of 1471, Edward IV 'kept his estate' in this same hall.[61]

The last heading in the counter-roll, however, speaks of Ornatus sedis regis in magna aula Westmonaster' die coronacionis regis. According to the first entry in this section, this chair was pro sessione sua in magna aula Westmonaster' predicto primo die februarii in coronacione sua. The word sessione is translated as 'sitting' or 'session' and, judging from this entry, could be taken as referring to the custom of sitting in the chair before the coronation. But a later entry in the same section speaks of mensam regis in sessione. The reference to the king's table fits the circumstances of the banquet after the coronation better.

The table and chair at which the king sat were situated at the south end of the hall on a small dais.[62] According to the antiquarian Mr. N. Bailey, the table was nineteen feet long by three feet wide; a new top of Purbeck marble was supplied for Edward II's coronation banquet and it was still in use in 1327. The chair, Mr. N. Bailey adds, was "where the kings of England formerly sat at their Coronation Dinners, and at other solemn times, the Lord Chancellors."[63] For Edward II's coronation the chair was supplied with two copper knobs and with a copper gilt image of a king in "a certain arch over the royal seat on the feast of the coronation."[64] Presumably the chair still had at least the copper knobs for Edward III's banquet.

Edward III's chair had a canopy made from twelve cloths ad aurum in canabo. There were also hangings (dorsoria) for the chair made from thirty and three-quarter ells of panni ad aurum in serico de Turk', which presumably hung from the canopy. There is a rather curious entry in the counter-roll concerning the protection of these same dorsoria.

> Eodem die pro eisdem dorsoriis saluandis ab humiditate murorum de canabo - - - . xxiiii. ulne.

It throws a rather interesting light on the atmosphere in Westminster Hall. Just how effective these canvas linings were is a matter for speculation. Another entry also relates to the canopy.

> Eodem die ad .i. uolettum pro eadem celura dicte sedis in eadem aula facienda cum labellis pendentibus ante mensam regis in sessione sua de cindoni rubeo et glauceo affortiato - - -. iiii. pecie

Unfortunately, it is not clear exactly what a uolettum is. Judging from this entry, the uolettum somehow fits over the canopy and from it labella, which are probably heraldic badges, hang down in front of the king's table. The Word-List has no entry under uolettum and Du Cange[65] simply describes it as a velum minus. Presumably it is some sort of veil which hung a short way down from the canopy. But once the dorsoria, uolettum and the labella had been affixed one would imagine that the king was somewhat obscured.

The last two entries in this section of the counter-roll are concerned with the king's comfort. Two pieces of velvet containing 14½ ells were used ad ponendum sub rege eidem sessioni. Although it seems to be rather a large amount of cloth, this velvet evidently was to be placed on the seat of the chair, for the next entry concerns three samite cushions which were to be used ad idem. The counter-roll, unfortunately, does not have any more information about the preparations for the banquet.

Invaluable information about the preparation of Westminster Abbey for the coronation is found in the counter-roll of the Great Wardrobe, although it is impossible to know exactly what some of the cloths mentioned in the counter-roll are.[66] The most important place during the ceremony of coronation was the raised platform called the pulpitulum. This pulpitulum was a high stage or platform built in the open area underneath the central crossing tower, between the choir and the high altar; there were steps on its north and east sides. It was on this stage that the king's coronation chair was placed and on it many of the events of the ceremony took place. Naturally the *pulpitulum* was richly decorated; six different types of material were used to ornament it.

> *. . . pro plauncheriis eiusdem pulpituli in eadem ecclesia ubique cooperiendis de tapetis diuersi coloris - - - .xxi. tapeta*

Three different types of cloth *ad aurum in canabo*, *tartarei radiati*, and *cindoni affortiato* were mixed with *pannus ad aurum in serico* and draped or hung around the stage *super latera et bordera ex utraque parte*. Presumably these cloths were to hang down from the edges of the two sides without steps and to lie over the steps. Two purple cloths *ad aurum in canabo* were suspended above the king's chair and five cushions *de camaca* were provided *ad ponendum sub rege et pedibus suis in eadem cathedra*.[67] Moreover, the Great Wardrobe supplied 1½ ells of cloth of *Tarsensis* to cover three cushions which were to be put under the feet of the king descending *de magna cathedra in pulpitulo post quam fuit unctus*. The chair itself, which may have been the one Edward I had had made to hold the Stone of Destiny, was embellished with the same varieties of cloth as were used on the *pulpitulum*. The decoration of the stage and chair is mentioned in the coronation *ordo* of the fourteenth century which is assigned to 1327.

> *le quel pulpit deuant la processioun doyt estre couert de totes partz de tapitz, et de draps de paraual et paramont par ses Ministres, et deinz cest pulpit soit vn chayer ordeyne honorablement couert de draps de soie, et quissus com il affiert. . . .*[68]

The high stage and the coronation chair centered under the hangings, both of them decorated with rich and brightly coloured cloths and cushions, must have been an impressive sight.

The area east of the stage, the chancel around the high altar, was, of course, also decorated. Four cloths of gold *in serico diaspinet'* and one each of cloth of gold *in serico tartareo* and purple velvet were spread on the pavement around the high altar. The *ordo* mentioned above refers to this covering of the pavement:

> *[le dit prince] se doit abesser deuant le dit autere sur le pavement, qui sera deuant couert de tapitz, par ses Ministres . . . .*[65]

The reason for covering the pavement is thus explained.

In front of the altar were two chairs, one for the king and one for the archbishop of Canterbury. The counter-roll records that the king's chair was ornamented with cloth of gold *de Nakta*, cloth of gold *in serico diaspinet'*, striped samite *de Styne*, and three cushions *de camaca*. The archbishop's chair had two *camaca* cushions and one cloth of gold *in serico raffata*, and it stood on two *tapeta*. This is the only use recorded in the counter-roll of cloth of gold *in serico raffata*, although eleven cloths were originally purchased at a cost of 60 s. each; it was obviously a costly fabric.

The cloth of gold *de Nakta* and the striped samite *de Styne* mentioned above were also used to decorate the king's *cubiculum*. The heading of the section in which these two cloths appear is as follows; *Ornatus cubiculi regis in consecracione sua*. The usual meaning given to *cubiculum* is 'bed-chamber' or 'sleeping place' - connotations which hardly fit this context. The *cubiculum* was perhaps a small disrobing area close to the altar where the king divested himself of the coronation robes and donned the garments which he would wear at the banquet. In addition to the two cloths mentioned above, the *cubiculum* was embellished with four *camaca* cushions and a cloth of gold *in serico diaspinet'*.

The most unusual need for which the Great Wardrobe released cloth concerned the tomb of Edward the Confessor, which was situated just behind the high altar.

> *Eodem die pro tumba domini Edwardi Aui illustri regis Edwardi tercii a conquestu in sollempnitate predicte coronacionis sue cooperienda de pannis ad aurum in serico optimis diaspinet' simul consuturis propter latitudinem dicte tumbe - - - .ii. panni*

Westminster Abbey was dedicated to the memory of Edward the Confessor and his shrine was "intended to be the climax of the whole building."[70] One can only speculate that this tomb was covered during the coronation as a mark of special esteem and reverence. The Confessor's shrine consisted of a *feretrum*, which was a richly decorated wooden chest with a sloping roof and gabled ends containing the saint's relics, placed on a large stone base. It was probably only the *feretrum* proper which was covered by the two cloths.

The Great Wardrobe supplied material to be used in the king's chamber and chapel in Westminster palace. The first entry in the section explains that this was used to outfit and decorate them.

> *Item in apparatu et ornamento camere regis in nocte antequam suscepisset ordinem militaris uidelicet in palacio suo apud Westmonasterium ultimo die ianuarii anno eodem de tapetis rubeis cum scutis in corneris de armis regis - - - .v. tapeta.*

The chapel was furnished with three samite cushions for the vigil of knighthood and, *post miliciam*, the chamber was adorned with bench-covers of various colours: four red ones with green fringes, one green one, three of blue and murrey,[71] and three more similar to the red *tapeta* decorated in the corners with the royal arms. Six samite cushions were also furnished for the chamber.

According to the counter-roll, the largest amount of cloth released at one time by the Great Wardrobe was for carpeting between the palace at Westminster and the abbey church there. Fifteen cloths of Candlewikstret' - each one containing forty ells, making a total of 600 ells - were used

> ad ponendum sub pedibus regis nudus (sic) pedes (sic) transseuntis (sic) die coronacionis regis uidelicet a lecto suo usque ecclesiam et de ecclesia usque cameram regis post coronacionis redeuntis . . . .[72]

The need for the carpet is obvious.

After the king had entered the abbey and the anthem Firmetur had been sung, the archbishop was to lead the king up to the high altar and, in fulfillment of the text Non appareas uacuus in conspectu domini dei tui, he was to offer un drap dore ou soye.[73] The counter-roll records that one cloth of gold in serico diaspinet' was supplied for this oblation.

Another item for the coronation which is mentioned in the counter-roll is a pair of silk gloves bought from Hugo de Garton for 3 .s. These gloves were pro rege in coronacione sua quando fuit consecratus. Surprisingly enough, they are the only articles of clothing for the king specifically referred to in the counter-roll; perhaps some of the cloths listed in it were used in making the king's robes.

In addition to the provision of cloth for the decoration of the palace and abbey and for the oblation, many other preparations for the coronation had to be made.

At a great festival, such as a coronation, it was customary to knight several young nobles as part of the celebrations. These prospective knights were usually given new robes and other gifts for the occasion by the king. It was the Great Wardrobe which supplied these gifts. T. F. Tout in his Chapters in Medieval Administrative History prints part of the receipt which one such new knight made for the robe he received on the occasion of Edward III's coronation:

> Pateat uniuersis per presentes quod ego, Hubaud, recepi de domino Thoma de Useflete, clerico magne garderobe domini

> regis ad apparatum meum pro militia mea particulas subscriptas, uidelicet de panno bruno, etc.[74]

John de Bohun, earl of Hereford, was another one who received material for his knighting from the Great Wardrobe. Cockayne's Complete Peerage has an interesting note from a 'role of liveries' of the Great Wardrobe about the items which de Bohun received from Thomas de Useflete.

> Johanni de Bouhon consanquineo Regis ad apparatum summ pro milicia tamquam pro comite suspicienda per mandatum domini Edwardi illustris Regis Anglie primogeniti - Lond' xx die Januarii anno presenti xx mo. He received a tunic and a cloak of brown cloth, materials for his bed and bedding, cloth of gold, a robe of scarlet cloth and another of green cloth. The words "tamquam pro comite" do not appear to have any technical meaning, because others who were not earls received the same with the same words used.[75]

According to Adam Murimuth, "Quo die (1 February 1327) .iii. filii domini R.(ogeri) de Mortuo mari, et multi alii, milites facti fuerunt."[76] Judging from the number of items which were given to John de Bohun, the provision of gifts for the prospective knights would have involved a lot of work for the Great Wardrobe. Although, strictly speaking, this work was not part of the coronation preparations, it was an indispensible part of the festival surrounding the crowning of a new king: it was part of the acquisition and distribution of the enormous amount of material which a successful coronation demanded.

Not all of this material was collected and supplied by the Great Wardrobe; other offices of the Household were also involved. The cloth of gold which the king offered on the high altar has already been mentioned. But, in addition to offering the cloth, the king presented un liuer dore and then, later in the ceremony during the offertory of the mass, un mark.[77] Both of these items were supplied by the Exchequer to the Wardrobe. Fortunately, the relevant entries in the Household Book and the Issue roll of the Exchequer have survived.

> *Et per manus dicti Iohannis de Houton in precio .viii^{xx}.xiiii. florenorum de florentia pro oblacione domini regis die coronacionis sue et continentes libra .ciiii. florenorum et marca .lxx. florenorum per breve privato sigillo precii cuiuslibet floreni .iii. s. iiii. d. ob. ibidem eodem die (29 January) .xxviii. li. xii. s. ix. d.*

> Issue Roll, Michaelmas, 1 Edward III.
> 4th February - To Robert de Wodehouse, keeper of the king's wardrobe, for the price of 174 florins from Florence, price each florin as purchased 39½ .d., paid to the same keeper by the hands of John de Houton his clerk, for one pound and one mark of gold to make oblations on the day of the coronation for the Lord the king: - and in like manner was delivered 104 florins and a mark of 70 .s. by the king's command . . . £28 12 .s. 6 .d.[78]

The entry in the Issue roll contains an obvious mistake; it is dated 4 February. A possible explanation for this error is found in the Household Book. Immediately prior to the entry about the oblation in the Household Book the date 4 February appears in connection with a writ of liberate; the Issue roll perhaps is similar. Furthermore, there is a discrepancy concerning the cost of the florins between these two entries. The Household Book gives a cost of 3 .s. 4½ .d. *per* florin - a penny more than the Issue roll - for a total of £28 12 .s. 9 .d.. The total in the Issue roll, however, is only £28 12 .s. 6 .d. - three pennies less: but this total has been incorrectly calculated; it should be the same as that given in the Household Book. The higher price *per* florin recorded in the Household Book is easily explained by scribal error. If the price of the cloth of gold is added to that of the gold, the cost of Edward II's oblations comes to roughtly £31.

Edward II also offered a pound and a mark of gold, but there is no record of his presenting cloth as well. The two pieces of gold, however, were fashioned to represent a legend from the life of Edward the Confessor. The pound weight, which was offered first, was *ymago sancti Edwardi anulum peregrino offerentis*; the mark was *ymago peregrini manum extendentis ad* *suscipiendum anulum de manis sancti Edwardi regis*, There is no record of the oblations at other coronations being similarly fashioned and at Edward III's coronation, as Dr. H. G. Richardson remarks, "it seems probable that the haste attending the coronation . . . would leave no time for attending to such a detail."[79]

One of the last arrangements to have been made probably was the provision of various necessary precious objects (*iocalia*). This was also done through the Wardrobe. The Household Book contains a section about the *iocalia* used for the coronation. These were released from the treasury in the Tower of London to Robert de Wodehouse, the keeper of the Wardrobe, by indenture between his clerk, John de Houton, and Walter de Norwich, a baron of the Exchequer, *pro coronacione regis*. This transaction is not dated, but Adam Orleton is named as treasurer and he was not appointed until 28 January; so, at the very earliest, the indenture could not have been drawn up before 28 January. The following items were received by the wardrobe: a gold cup with a cover, the pommel of which was enamelled with the king's arms, which had been given to Edward II by Hugh Despenser the younger, worth £28 13 .s.; a gold ewer with an enamelled cover and two pearls worth £40 12 .s. 6 .d.; and a gold brooch ornamented with six half-circles set with pearls and precious stones worth £20. The cup and the ewer were taken by the mayor of London as his fee for helping the butler, while the brooch was returned *in thesarium per manus domini Iohanni Waryn unius camerarii de scaccario immediate post prandium die coronacionis regis*.[80]

Oddly enough there are only these three entries in the Household Book dealing with *iocalia* released by the treasury for the coronation. One would suppose that, quite apart from the *regalia*, the coronation would have required many more jewels and precious objects. There are long lists in the Household Book of jewels purchased in the more settled circumstances of 1328 for Edward's wedding, and one would presume that his coronation was made as impressive as possible.[81]

It is possible that some *iocalia* were held in a joint wardrobe that Edward appears to have shared for a time with his mother. There are two references in the *Patent Rolls* to "the wardrobe of Queen Isabella and Edward the king's first-born son."[82] The king's Household Book mentions that a number of items belonging to the king were in the keeping of his mother's wardrobe.

> *Iocalia, vessella argenti, et alia subscripta recepta in garderobam regis . . . primo die marcii anno primo de domino Iohanne Oxendon custodi garderobe regine de illis iocalis, vessellis, et aliis dicti domini ante coronacionem suam in custodi dicti domini Iohannis apud Paris mense februarii anno regni domini Edwardi patris domini regis nunc .xix. existentia.*[83]

It is possible that some of the precious objects which are listed under this heading and in other places as being in this joint wardrobe were used in the coronation.

Furthermore there was certainly a large supply of precious objects available from the forfeited estates of Edward II's supporters; however, many of these items were given away as gifts by Isabella. Such items which were not given away went into the wardrobe and some were used in the coronation. The pantler, Thomas le Wake, received as his fee a gilded and enamelled gold salt-cellar, which previously had belonged to the earl of Arundel.[84] Finally, according to the B. L. Cotton Charter IV 9, Robert de Wodehouse, the keeper of the Wardrobe, received several precious objects, one of which was worth nearly £50, from the treasurer on 31 January for use in the coronation ceremony.[85]

If these odd pieces of information are taken together, they give the impression that only a moderate number of precious objects were used at Edward III's coronation and banquet. The evidence, however, is far from conclusive. The Household Book certainly suggests that no jewels were bought for the coronation, although it does show that a number of precious objects were used at the banquet.

Judging from the surviving evidence, the preparations for Edward III's coronation do not seem to have been particularly lavish. In the opinion of Mr. H. M. Colvin, "the accounts of the clerk of the works at Westminster [do not] suggest that the arrangements involved any unusual expenditure."[86] As for the decoration of Westminster Abbey and the great banqueting hall, the Great Wardrobe released at most £200 worth of material[87] - a moderate sum, neither princely nor miserly. The provision of jewels and other precious objects for the coronation was far from liberal. Of all the preparations, those which concerned the banquet seem to have been the most lavish, costing for food alone, if the Annales prioratus de Dunstapalia are reliable, the impressive sum of £1034 2 .s. 6½ .d..[88]

A few surviving scraps of information about Edward I's coronation expenses allow a crude comparison to be drawn with those of Edward III. Entries in the Pipe Rolls show that at least £6,000 were spent on Edward I's coronation.[89] Roughly half of that amount was spent when Edward III was crowned, although admittedly the reliability of the Pipe Rolls is greater that that of the Annales prioratus de Dunstapalia. But it must be remembered that the preparations for Edward III's coronation were extremely rushed. Given the circumstances, the preparations seem to have been as lavish as was possible.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Polychronicon of Ranulph Higden, ed. J. R. Lumby, 9 vols. Rolls Series (London, 1882), 8:324; "Annales monasterii de Osenia," in Annales Monastici, ed. H. Luard, 5 vols. Rolls Series (London, 1869), 4:348; "De Gestis Edwardi tertii of Robert of Avebury," in Continuatio Chronicarum of Adam Murimuth, ed. E. M. Thompson, Rolls Series (London, 1889), p. 283; "Vita Edwardi secundi autore Malmesberiensi," in Chronicles of the reigns of Edward I and Edward II, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols. Rolls Series (London, 1883), 2:290.

2. "Annales prioratus de Dunstapalia" in Annales Monastici, 3:411.

3. Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae, et Cuiuscunque Generis Acta Publica, ed. T. Rymer, 7 vols. (London: Record commission, 1816-69), 2, pt. 2:684.

4. Public Record Office, Exchequer Accounts Various, E 101/383/6 (hereafter cited as Counter-roll). A discussion of this counter-roll along with a Latin transcription of it appears in the appendix to this thesis.

5. Joshua Barnes, History of Edward III, (Cambridge, 1688), p. 4.

6. J. H. Round, The King's Serjeants and Officers of State, (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1911; reprint ed., London: Tabard Press, 1970), p. 169n.5.

7. W. Warburton, Edward III, (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1902).

8. Paul Johnson, The Life and Times of Edward III, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973).

9. Percy Ernst Schramm, A History of the English Coronation, trans. L. G. Wickham-Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937).

10. Ibid., p. 10.

11. Historia Anglicana of Thomas Walsingham, 1:186; the Household Book of 1-2 Edward III - Public Record Office, Exchequer Accounts Various, E 101/383/8 (hereafter cited as Household Book), fos. 19-20.

12. Ibid.

13. *Continuatio Chronicarum of Adam Murimuth*, p. 57.

14. *Chronicon Henrici Knighton*, ed. J. R. Lumby, 2 vols. Rolls Series (London, 1889), 1:449.

15. *Chronicon monasterii de Melsa*, ed. E. A. Bond, 3 vols. Rolls Series (London, 1867), 2:385

16. See Fryde, *The tyranny and fall of Edward II*, chap. 7.

17. A further £13,295 came in when Caerphilly castle, where Edward II, Hugh Despenser the younger, and the earl of Arundel had left money and plate, finally surrendered late in February. Ibid., p. 209.

18. The new rulers also did very well personally. Isabella seized most of Hugh Despenser the younger's lands and the lands from which Edward II's chamber derived its revenue, as well as greatly increasing her dower. Mortimer expanded his holdings in the Welsh March, to the great alarm of other Marcher lords. The Arundel lands were appropriated by Edward III's uncle, the earl of Kent. Ibid., p. 208.

19. The new government, however, soon needed every penny it could get. At the end of the summer of 1327 the government was forced to borrow from the Bardi. By the beginning of July 1328, reserves well in excess of £62,000 had dwindled to a mere £1,355 11 .s. 3½ .d.. Ibid., pp. 212-15.

20. For a discussion of what an *ordo* is see chapter 3 below.

21. H. M. Colvin, gen, ed., *The History of the King's Works*, 3 vols. (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1963), 1:506-07.

22. *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1327-1330*, p. 107. (hereafter cited as C. Cl. R.).

23. Household Book, fo. 1. There is a rather curious entry in the *Close Roll* dated 8 January 1327 about a barrel of venison.
8 January Kenilworth 1327
To Henry de Belton. Order to deliver the barrel of venison that belonged to Edmund, late earl of Arundel, now in his custody, to the sheriff of York, to do therewith what the king has enjoined upon him.
To the sheriff of York. Order to receive the aforesaid barrel of venison, and to cause it to be carried to Westminster without delay in the king's cart with five horses that are in his custody, to be delivered to the king's receiver of victuals at Westminster. (*C. CL. R., 1327-30*, p. 625.) This venison was possibly to be used for the coronation feast. The writ could not be more explicit because Edward II was still king. The local supplies at Westminster were doubtless inadequate to meet the needs of the coronation

banquet, but even so, York is a long way from Westminster. Perhaps the earl of Arundel was famous for his venison, which was presumably pickled.

24. See Appendix II

25. H. G. Richardson, "Early Coronation Records: the coronation of Edward II," in Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research (hereafter cited as B.I.H.R.) 16 (1938-39): 3n.4.

26 Joshua Barnes, History of Edward III, p. 3.

27. Foedera, 2, pt. 2:683.

28. The Chronicle of Lanercost, p. 256.

29. Foedera, 2, pt. 2:683.

30. Chronicon monasterii de Melsa, 2:354.

31. H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles, "Early Coronation Records," B.I.H.R. 14 (1936-37): 5-6. Fortunately Drs. Richardson and Sayles have printed several very useful documents relating to the coronation serjeantries of 1327. These documents are: an incomplete enrolment of the petitions along with the original petitions, a writ initiating payment of one of the fees, and a return of writ from the Exchequer regarding one of the claims.

32. Ibid., p.7.

33. Adam de Clifton presented his petition in the Chancery on 30 January. Robert de Mohaut's original petition is not dated. A writ asking for verification of the petition was sent to the Exchequer. The return of writ which was made by the Exchequer dates the original writ 20 January. This date, however, is an alteration from some other date, possibly 29 January. The date of 20 January seems too early for the presentation of a petition to perform a coronation service; Edward III had not yet been acclaimed king. The later date would be more plausible; and moreover, it is consistent with the dates of the other petitions.
Ibid., pp. 5, 8.

34. Ibid., p. 8.

35. Ibid., p. 5.

36. L. G. Wickham-legg, ed., English Coronation Records (Westminster: Archibald Constable & Co., 1901), pp. 133-34.

37. Richardson and Sayles, "Early Coronation Records," 14 p. 8.

38. Ibid., pp. 4-6.

39. Round, The King's Serjeants, p. 383.

40. Richardson and Sayles, "Early Coronation Records," 14 pp. 6-7.

41. Ibid., pp. 5, 2, 6.

42. This petition is found in the record of the Court of Claims for Richard II. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, pp. 145, 163.

43. Richardson and Sayles, "Early Coronation Records," 14 p. 5.

44. Household Book, fos. 19-21.

45. C. CL. R., 1323-27, p. 629.

46. See n. 4 above and Appendix II. Household Book.

47. "Annales prioratus de Dunstapalia," 3:411

48. Ibid., p. x.

49. The list is possibly the work of some royal clerk who was pensioned off to the priory of Dunstaple and who, having perhaps worked in the Exchequer, wanted to add to the "Annales."

50. Fredrick Devon, ed., Issues of the Exchequer, Henry III-Henry VI (London: Record Commission, 1837), pp. 121-22.

51. Ibid., p. 121.

52. Foedera, 2:7.

53. Foedera, original ed. 17 vols. (London: A. and J. Churchill, 1704-17), 2:21.

54. But see n. 23 above.

55. Devon, Issues of the Exchequer, p. 121.

56. C. CL. R., 1323-27, p. 629.

57. See n. 4 above and Appendix II.

58. R. E. Latham, Revised Medieval Latin Word-List (London: published for the British Academy by the Oxford University Press, 1973).

59. Colvin, The History of the King's Works, 2:1042.

60. Richardson, "Early Coronation Records: the coronation of Edward II," p. 9.

61. Colvin, The History of the King's Works, 2:508, 536 n. 5.

62. At Edward I's coronation the royal mason, Robert de Beverley, was paid £50 "to erect a stage for the feast of the king's coronation." Devon, Issues of the Exchequer, p. 84.

63. Colvin, The History of the King's Works, 1:544.

64. Ibid., 1:545.

65. Du Cange, Glossarium mediae et infimae Lantinitatis (Paris: Didot Fratres, 1890).

66. See Appendix II.

67. An entry in the counter-roll says that John de Feryby was appointed ad hoc by the steward and treasurer of the Household to witness the decoration of the pulpitulum. Perhaps he was to supervise the operation.

68. This ordo is found in Chancery series C. 49 roll 11 dorse and is published in J. W. Wickham-Legg, ed, Three Coronation Orders Henry Bradshaw Society Publications 19 (1900): 122. I have not been able to relate the cloths mentioned in this quotation to those recorded in the counter-roll.

69. Ibid., p. 122.

70. Colvin, The History of the King's Works, 1:147-48.

71. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (1971), murrey is a blood-red or purple-red colour.

72. The arrangements for this carpeting were the responsibility of the almoner, who, on this occasion, may have been the earl of Hereford. After the coronation, the carpeting inside the precinct of the abbey was claimed by the sacrist, while the remainder belonged to the almoner. After Richard II's coronation in 1377, however, the monks of Westminster also claimed the rest of the material and furnishings which were inside the church. This particular claim seems to have originated in 1327 after Edward III's coronation when the monks kept the various hangings, cloths, and cushions which had been used to decorate the church. When the clerk of the Great Wardrobe's account was audited in 1332, the Exchequer appealed the monks' claim to the king. Edward III, as an act of grace, upheld the monks' claim. See H. G. Richardson, "The Coronation in Medieval England: the Evolution of the Office and the Oath," Traditio 16 (1960): 128n.13; H. G. Richardson and G. O Sayles, "Early Coronation Records," B.I.H.R. 13 (1935-36): 138.

73. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. 86; J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, pp. 122-23.

74. Tout, *Chapters*, 4:413-14.

75. G. C. Cockayne, *Complete Peerage*, rev. ed. edited by Vicary Gibbs et al., 13 vols. (London: St. Catherine Press, 1910-40), 6:470. It is interesting to note that Edward is still referred to as "the Lord Edward, the king of England's first-born son."

76. *Continuatio Chronicarum of Adam Murimuth*, p. 51.

77. J. W. Wickham-Legg, *Three Coronation Orders*, pp. 122-23.

78. Household Book, fo. 1; Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 139.

79. Richardson, "Early Coronation Records: the coronation of Edward II," pp. 7, 10.

80. Household Book, fos. 19-21.

81. Household Book, fos. The Bardi spent £2417 10 .s. 3 .d. on providing *iocalia* for Edward III's wedding. Fryde, *The tyranny and fall of Edward II*, p. 214.

82. *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1324-27*, pp. 338-39. (hereafter cited as *C. P. R.*).

83. Household Book, fo. 21.

84 Household Book, fo. 19.

85 . Haines, *The Church and Politics*, p. 178.

86. Colvin, *The History of the King's Works*, 1:509.

87. The difficulty in arriving at a more exact figure will be examined later.

88. "Annales prioratus de Dunstapalia," 3:411.

89. H. G. Richardson, "The English Coronation Oath," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 4th. ser. 23 (1941): 137n.2.

CHAPTER III

THE CORONATION CEREMONY AND BANQUET

The day of young Edward's coronation was one of hectic and constant activity. Edward had first to be knighted, then to be crowned, and finally to attend his coronation banquet.

Edward's knighting, of course, was not part of the coronation; rather it was a necessary preliminary to that ceremony. Until a man was knighted he was considered unfit to lead troops in battle. Since leading his people in war was a vital part of a king's duties, it was, no doubt, deemed important that he should be crowned as a knight.[1]

The knighting of a royal heir was usually an occasion for much pomp and pageantry. In England it was customary for important heirs to be knighted together - a custom which made the occasion even more impressive. One of the most spectacular ceremonies was the knighting of Edward II by his father in 1306. Richard Barber writes of that ceremony:

> The most splendid group [of companions] was that at Edward II's knighting in 1306, when 276 squires accompanied the twenty-two-year-old prince. Because the palace was too small, the grounds of the Temple were commandeered, and tents pitched there. All expenses, save those of horses and armour, were paid, and the richest garments provided. The night before Whitsun the prince and a few chosen companions kept vigil at Westminster, the remainder at the Temple; the prince then was knighted at the palace by his father, and returned to Westminster to knight the other candidates.[2]

At the time of his coronation Edward III was only some fourteen years and two-and-a-half months old, so it is hardly surprising that he had not yet been knighted.[3] In more normal circumstances young Edward would presumably have been knighted by his father. The deposition of Edward II, however, made this impossible. The obvious person to perform the ceremony would have been Henry earl of Lancaster, a relative of the king and the principal member of his council.

According to the Gesta Edwardi tertii auctore Bridlingtoniensi, Edward "received the order of knighthood from John, the brother of the count of Hainault."[4] Thomas Walsingham, however, writes that:

> Edwardus juvenis suscepit arma militaria, cum multis aliis juvenibus generosis, per Dominum Comitem Lancastriae, praesente Domino Johanne fratre Comities Hanoniae, qui in Anglia tunc agebat, et multis aliis tam indigens quam externis, et eodem die coronatus est.[5]

Walsingham probably is the more reliable writer. Perhaps the account of the coronation in the Gesta confused events. Its writer knew that John of Hainault was present and possibly assisted at the ceremony: he may have assumed, from the foreign warrior's fame, that he had done the knighting.

As Walsingham makes clear, a number of other young men were knighted at the same time as Edward. In the previous chapter it was shown that these included three sons of Roger Mortimer and John de Bohun, earl of Hereford.[6] Despite the chronicler's phrase "multis aliis", it is doubtful that Edward had a large number of companions in the ceremony. Whether or not the young ruler himself knighted some of those companions we do not know.

The counter-roll implies that the vigil before the knighting was undertaken in the chapel of Westminster palace which was supplied with cushions. Since the king's chamber in the same palace was specially decorated, it might be suggested that the ceremony of knighting took place here. The six cushions supplied to the chamber seem to indicate that the ceremony was a small one.

The coronation of an English king follows an ordo, that is, a liturgical document, a service book. The rubrics of an ordo give directions or explanations to those taking part in the service; the prayers and canticles which must be chanted during the ceremony are also given, The essentials of all English coronation ordines date back to the one drawn up possibly by archbishop Dunstan for the coronation of Edgar at Bath in 973. Over the years it was considered necessary to revise the ordo. The earliest version is called the first recension. The third recension of the ordo lasted from the beginning of the twelfth century when it was drawn up, perhaps by Anselm, until the opening years of the fourteenth century when the first form of the fourth recension was prepared for Edward II's coronation in 1308. The most extensive and explicit of the medieval ordines is a later form of the fourth recension which was probably used for Richard II's coronation in 1377 - the so-called Lytlington ordo.

One of the most difficult problems connected with Edward III's coronation is the identification of the ordo which was followed. This problem has generated much scholarly dispute which, unfortunately, has not produced any firm conclusion. There are a number of ordines extant in various fourteenth-century manuscripts, one of which possibly was used in 1327.

A. Chancery series of parliamentary and council proceedings No. 49 roll 11 (hereafter called manuscript A.). This roll is a private collection of several documents: a version of the petitions presented to the January assembly of 1327; a version of William Trussell's renunciation of homage to Edward II;[7] a coronation ordo; and a record of the judgement on Hugh Despenser the younger. These documents are all written in French.

Drs. Richardson and Sayles suggest, for two reasons, that this particular ordo was intended for the use of a layman who wanted to follow the ceremony: it is written in French and, while the rubrics are complete, only the incipits of the prayers and canticles are given. The coronation ordo has been "indifferently edited" by J. W. Wickham-Legg in Three Coronation Orders.[8]

B. British Library Cotton MS. Julius A. 1 (hereafter called manuscript B.). Folios 54-62 of this collection of miscellanea contain a group of documents similar to those found in the Chancery roll discussed above: the judgement of Hugh Despenser the younger; a record of events between 13-20 January 1327; William Trussell's renunciation of homage; Edward III's first statute; a coronation ordo.

C. British Library MS. Vitellius, C.XII (hereafter called manuscript C.). Folios 231-5b contain three ordines, each of which gives a different form of the oath. The second ordo (fos. 232-4b) is in French; the other two are in Latin.

D. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS. No. 20 (hereafter called manuscript D.). This manuscript contains a coronation ordo in French which is very similar in the form both of the service and of the oath to the second ordo in manuscript C. It also has been edited by J. Wickham-Legg in Three Coronation Orders. It has been dated about 1327 by a Mr. Warner.[9]

E. Cambridge University MS. iii, 21 (hereafter called manuscript E.). This manuscript is a pontifical, a book of episcopal rites, from the diocese of Lincoln which contains a coronation ordo. This ordo shows a number of variations from other surviving forms of the fourth recension, particularly in its emphasis on the role of the people in the coronation.

It has been published in W. Maskell's Monumenta ritualia ecclesiae anglicanae.[10]

F. British Library Lansdowne MS. 451 (hereafter called manuscript F.). Folio 100d of this manuscript contains an ordo similar to the one found in MS. E. It is probably from Exeter.

The discussion of the manuscripts of fourteenth-century coronation ordines is, in the main, to be found in three long articles written between 1935 and 1960 by Drs. H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles jointly, Dr. B. Wilkinson, and Dr. H. G. Richardson.[11] The arguments presented in these articles are often involved and sometimes less than convincing, and the conclusions are in some cases contradictory and in others less than final. The concluding remarks of Dr. B. Wilkinson's article, published in 1955, are still true today.

> In spite of fruitful preliminary investigations, . . . a detailed study of the fourteenth century records, which might establish reasonable certainty in regard to the dating, is still much to be desired.[12]

The ordo contained in manuscript A is assigned to 1327 by Drs. Richardson and Sayles simply because it is found alongside several other documents, all of which relate to the 1327 coup. They argue that these documents were written in a private roll "to serve an immediate and temporary demand for documents connected with the revolution," hence the ordo "must be that used at the coronation of Edward III."[13] This is certainly a valid point, although it is hardly conclusive.

There are, moreover, a few details in this ordo which do not harmonize with the facts of 1327. Notably, a rubric in the ordo names the earl of Hertford as the almoner; in 1327 there was no earl of Hertford. Drs. Richardson and Sayles explain this difficulty by saying that the title Hertford was often confused by scribes with that of Hereford - a title which had recently been restored.[14] Another rubric directs the earl of Chester to carry the sword Curtana before the king. The king himself was the earl of Chester: it is possible that Edward appointed a deputy to fulfill this duty. On the other hand, it should be noted that this ordo does mention the king's gloves; according to the counter-roll, gloves were certainly purchased for the coronation.

A similar ordo is found in manuscript B. The only notable difference between this ordo and that in manuscript A is that the earl of Bedford is named as almoner: this title was vacant in 1327. Again, Drs. Richardson and Sayles explain this difficulty by attributing it to scribal error.[15] If the ordo in manuscript A can be assigned to 1327, the one in manuscript B, which is close to being a copy of A, can be given the same date.

Dr. Wilkinson suggests that several other of the ordines "may possibly be related also to the coronation of 1327," one being that in manuscript D.[16] This ordo is prefaced by a picture of a coronation which can be dated about 1327. The king shown in the picture is bearded - which Edward III certainly was not in 1327, but the picture probably is "derivative and conventional."[17] A Mr. Warner, working from a photograph of the manuscript, dates the writing about 1325, "rather later than earlier."[18] Furthermore, this ordo does not provide a substitute for the archbishop of Canterbury - a necessity which arose in 1308.[19]

The coronation oath found in manuscript D differs from the two main forms of the oath which Edward II swore in 1308 - the record form written in French in the Close Rolls and the Latin from contained in the liturgical texts. In manuscript D, the oath refers only to saint Edward, unlike the Latin liturgical text which speaks of the glorious Edward or the French record version which mentions the glorious saint Edward. The king pledges in D to keep the laws des aunciens roys; in the two main forms of the oath the king's ancestors are referred to as vox predecessours. In the fourth promise of the oath in D the king swears "to keep the laws and customs which the community shall elect" - eslirra, the simple future.[20] The French record and the Latin liturgical versions, however, both refer to "the rightful laws and customs which the community shall have chosen' - aura esleu, the future perfect. These same small differences, which Dr. Wilkinson considers significant, are found in the second ordo in manuscript C, a fact which leads him to associate this ordo with that in D and assign it to 1327, even though manuscript C contains other coronation documents which can be definitely dated to 1308.

Dr. Wilkinson sees these differences not only in manuscripts C and D but also in manuscripts A and B: the fourth promise of the oath in all four manuscripts "agree in using the simple future eslirra; and they generally agree in having the 'people', or at least the communa, elect the laws." On the basis of this agreement Dr. Wilkinson postulates that a new or alternative form of the coronation oath, different from that used in 1308, was drawn up in 1327 - an oath which embodied " a remarkable theory of kingship," one which allowed the 'people' to elect laws in the future. He concludes that

> in 1327, though Edward III in fact took the same coronation oath as his father, there exist alternative drafts of proposals for his oath which are to be taken seriously. They suggest that there was a movement in 1327 to restore the word vulgus, or an equivalent, to the king's fourth coronation promise, and to make the vulgus unambiguously elect laws in the future, ...[22]

Dr. Wilkinson identifies yet another ordo drafted for Edward III's coronation - the one found in manuscripts E and F.[23] Manuscript E contains a marginal notation which strongly suggests that it was compiled prior to the Lytlington ordo, which was probably drawn up for Richard II's coronation in 1377.[24] Also, manuscript E does not mention dukes, unlike the Lytlington ordo which refers to two dukes, suggesting that it was written before 1351 when the first English duchy, that of Lancaster, was created.

Furthermore, Dr. Wilkinson argues that the ordo found in these two manuscripts shows an emphasis on the role of the 'people' similar to that found in manuscripts A, B, C, and D. This ordo directs that four earls ex parte populi should go to the church and ask the clergy to consecrate the prince who had been elected ab omni populo. The archbishop was then to send four bishops and abbots ad populum to ask if they would ratify the earls' request. If they did, the prince was then led into the church to be crowned. The prominence of election and the emphasis on the role of the people in this ordo agree best, according to Dr. Wilkinson, with the political crisis in 1327[25] - a crisis which brought the element of election in the coronation of a monarch to the fore at the expense of the principle of hereditary succession which "triumphed in 1272 and 1308."[26] Dr. Wilkinson therefore feels that this ordo may be the one which was followed in 1327.[27]

The ordines in all six manuscripts are assigned by Dr. Wilkinson to 1327. In four of the manuscripts he finds evidence for an alternative draft of the coronation oath in which the 'people' play an important role, and in the last two manuscripts he sees an emphsis on election. Although Dr. Wilkinson's arguments are interesting and at times telling, they are not conclusive.

Given the shortness of time, one must wonder if a number of ordines feasibly could have been drafted. It can also be objected that the significance of variations in the wording of the oath is far from clear, especially when Richardson and Sayles feel that a "disregard for the textual integrity of the oath [was] . . . characteristic of the period."[28] As for the emphasis on election which Dr. Wilkinson sees in Edward III's coronation, it seems doubtful that such an emphasis would have been acceptable to the leaders of the new regime. One would suppose that these men, having already taken the radical step of removing God's anointed, would have been anxious to increase the legitimacy of their rule by emphasizing that Edward III was the rightful and lawful successor to his father. They would have wanted to emphasize the hereditary principle which had "triumphed in 1272 and 1308" and to install Edward III as the new head of the kingdom as securely and with as little innovation as possible. The fact that Edward III swore the same oath as his father had sworn in 1308 is significant.

In the absence of any conclusive evidence identifying the _ordo_ followed in 1327, it is perhaps safest to conclude, along with Richardson and Sayles, that the _ordo_ found in manuscripts A and B alongside documents relating to 1327 was the one used at Edward III's coronation. In this writer's opinion, the simple arguments advanced by these scholars are more convincing than the somewhat tortuous ones of Dr. Wilkinson.

Before going on to discuss the exact proceedings of the coronation ceremony found in this _ordo_, it must be remembered that the rubrics of the _ordo_, which contain the directions for the service, are by no means an absolute guide as to what actually happened at the coronation. Drs. Richardson and Sayles have pointed out that while the Lytlington _ordo_, commonly held to have been the form of the _ordo_ used at Richard II's coronation, prescribes that the archbishop should ask the people for their assent to the king's coronation before the singing of the first anthem, in fact this formality was delayed until Richard had sworn the oath.[29] (The *ordo* for Edward III's coronation makes no mention of this formality.) There can be other inconsistencies.

In manuscript A the king is assigned two styles of clothing to wear during the unction, and two alternate places are given for divesting the king of the *regalia* - confirmation for Dr. Richardson of his suspicion that the rubrics of an *ordo* are a less than infallible guide to the actual details of the ceremony.[30] One must also remember that, as Dr. J. Bruckmann has pointed out, a medieval *ordo* is far from exhaustive; by no means every action is specified and indeed actions not recorded in the *ordo* also could have been performed at the ceremony.[31] Nevertheless, if due caution is exercised, the rubrics of an *ordo* can be a fairly reliable guide to ceremonial details. Without the rubrics of the *ordines* little would be known about what happened at a coronation.

The first rubric of the *ordo* in manuscript A is concerned with the preparations for the ceremony of coronation. It begins,

> *Fait a Remembrer qen le jour quant nouel Roi sera coroune affiert que le dist Roi soit primes baignee et puis vestu de neste vesturs fenduz deuant et derere nuement tanck al pitz les queux vestours deynt estre entreliez par botons, ou par laces, du soy et il doit estre chauce sanz soulers.*[32]

The slits in the clothing were to make the anointing easier. The bathing and dressing probably took place after the knighting in the king's chamber and no doubt afforded a welcome rest before the strain of the public ceremony.[33] The king was then directed to choose four nobles who would guard and support him throughout the day. One wonders how much choice Edward III in fact had: the positions were doubtless allotted according to political expediency.

While these preparations were going on, the ordo directs that the prelatz, et les nobles de la tere should assemble at the palace of Westminster to discuss the consecration of the new prince - not his election as manuscript E directs - and to confirm and establish firmly the laws and customs of the realm.[34] Exactly what happened at this gathering is difficult to say. The impression is that this custom was simply a formality - a survival of the ancient element of recognition. Even in the disturbed circumstances of Edward's accession it is hard to believe that anyone else could have been a serious candidate for the kingly consecration - notwithstanding the threat which Adam Orleton supposedly made to Edward II at Kenilworth.[35]

The ordo omits mention of the custom at this point in the ceremony of seating the king in a high chair which was prepared in a hall in the palace of Westminster.[36] Judging from the evidence of Edward II's coronation, once the king had been bathed and dressed he was seated on the chair by the nobles.[37] Then the various items of the regalia were handed over to those who were to carry them to the abbey. When all was ready, a procession was formed outside the palace to escort the king to the abbey church nearby. The abbot and the convent of Westminster came at the head of the procession, followed by the bishops and the archbishop of Canterbury, Walter Reynolds.[38] William Melton, the archbishop of York, who had firmly opposed the deposition of Edward II in the January assembly, perhaps was not present: he is not listed as being so in the Close Roll.[39] The omission of his name from this record is not conclusive proof of his absence. Two more of Edward II's supporters at the January assembly, the bishops of London and Rochester, are omitted also, but, as will be seen below, there is evidence to suggest that they were present at the coronation. The last two bishops in the procession were those holding the great offices of state: Adam Orleton the bishop of Hereford, who had just been appointed treasurer on 28 January, robed in a dalmatic, carried the paten of St. Edward; the chancellor, John Hotham bishop of Ely, who was similarly robed, held the paten of St. Edward. Behind these two officers came three earls carrying swords. The *ordo* particularly directs that these swords should be taken from the king's treasury. Two more earls, specially chosen by the king, were to carry the two sceptres which were also taken from the king's treasury. After these two earls *au dareyn vendra le Roi*. During the course of this procession the king was to be shielded by a canopy of purple cloth suspended from four lances gilded with gold with four gilt bells attached to them. This canopy was carried by sixteen barons of the Cinque Ports, a *chescun launce iiii barons*.[40]

This description of the procession in manuscript A is very brief compared to those in the Lytlington *ordo* and the account of Edward II's coronation.[41] For example, this *ordo* does not mention the coronation spurs, which were carried in the processions of 1308 and 1377 and which were certainly used in the ceremony of 1327. Neither does it record that it was customary for the monks of Westminster to bring the coronation vestments to the palace where the king appointed nobles to carry them to the abbey. At Edward II's coronation, there was

> *unum scaccarium magnum, super quod erant vestes regales, quod portabant comes Arundell, Thomas de Ver filius et heres comitis Oxoniae, Hugo le Depenser, et Rogerus de Mortuo Mari de Wygemor.*[42]

It is, however, possible that this service ceased in 1308 since I can find no record of it in 1377. Furthermore, there is no mention of the bishops of Durham and Bath and Wells, who traditionally supported and guided the king. These two bishops performed this service as early as Richard I's coronation and, according to the Lytlington *ordo*, they certainly performed it in 1377.[43] It is doubtful that such a well-established claim would have been lightly put aside, yet this service is hard to reconcile with the direction in the *ordo* that four nobles are to be selected *pur soen corps garder et supporter par tute la iourne de son corounement*. But it is possible that the service of the bishops was excused without prejudice on this occasion since John Droxford, the bishop of Bath and Wells, was old and probably not present at the coronation and the bishop of Durham, Louis de Beaumont, was lame and apparently stuttered.[44] It is almost certain that neither bishop was opposed to Isabella and Mortimer.[45]

The members of the procession had only a short way to walk since the palace of Westminster was right beside the abbey church. The route was carpeted since the king was barefooted. The procession entered the abbey church through the great north transept, not through the west door. The transept was the ceremonial entrance to the abbey church for a number of reasons. It was closer to the palace, which lay at a right angle to the east end of the abbey, than the west end of the nave. Furthermore, as Mr. H. M. Colvin has suggested, during the long period of the abbey's construction it would have been impractical to conduct a ceremonial procession down the nave which was littered with refuse and building material.[46] Consequently the facade of the north transept was designed to be prominent and impressive.

Once the procession had entered the abbey church it continued south down the transept to the *pulpitulum* which was situated directly beneath the crossing tower in between the choir and the high altar. The king mounted the *pulpitulum* and when he was seated on his chair the anthem *Firmetur* was sung.[47]

After the anthem, the archbishop along with *les autres prelatz* led the king up to the high altar on which he was to offer a cloth of gold and a pound of gold. It is possible that Stephen Gravesend the bishop of London, a supporter of Edward II whose name is omitted from the *Close Roll*, was one of *les autres prelatz*. The *Annales Paulini* records that

> *dominus Edwardus . . . per archepiscopum Cantuariensem fuit coronatus; aliis episcopis, videlicet Londoniensi et Wyntoniensi, ministrantibus circa solempnizationem coronationis.*[48]

Immediately following this oblation the king *se doit abesser deuant le dit autere sur le pauement, qi sera deuant couert de tapitz*. Then the archbishop was to recite over him the prayer *Deus humilium*. The next direction is unique to manuscript A *ordo* and gives an interesting sidelight on medieval ceremonies. After the prayer, *un sermon couenable dit par ascun prelat, si le temps soffre*.[49] One wonders how and by whom it was determined whether or not there was sufficient time.

Following the sermon, if it was given, the archbishop was to administer the oath to the king. This oath formed a contract between the king and his subjects. The king swore that he would rule according to law and justice and grant the accustomed freedoms both to the church and the people. On the other hand, the king received fealty and homage. The element of contract implied in the oath is illustrated by the bishop of Rochester's reply when asked by Sir John Suly, a knight who was attending Edward III's coronation, whether the king would keep the laws which the people chose. The bishop answered that if the king would not swear to keep the laws then he would not be crowned.[50] Although the form of the oath had remained unchanged throughout the thirteenth century, as a result of the political pressures generated in the last repressive years of Edward I's rule, the oath which was sworn by his son, Edward II, was modified in favour of the people: a fourth clause was added to the oath which made the king swear to uphold laws which the people would choose. The proper interpretation of this oath is far from clear and it has occasioned a good deal of controversy. It was this modified oath which Edward III swore in 1327.[51]

Once the oath had been taken, the archbishop *par haut voice* was to begin the hymn, *Veni creator*. Meanwhile, the king was once again to prostrate himself before the high altar and prelates were then to say the prayer *Te invocamus domine*. Once the prayer was finished, two bishops or possibly two cantors were to start chanting the litany *par haut voice* while the archbishop and the other prelates were to prostrate themselves and chant *de quoer* the seven penitential psalms *par bas voice*. These directions concerning how the litany should be sung are unique to this *ordo*.[52] At the conclusion of the litany certain prayers were to be said. Although the bishop of Rochester, Hamo de Hethe, is not mentioned in the *Close Roll* account of the coronation, the *Historia Roffensis* records that in the ceremony *Episcopi Norwicensis et Roffensis letaniam canebant*.[53] Like the bishop of London, Hamo de Hethe had been one of Edward II's few supporters at the January assembly. Perhaps it was their loyalty to Edward II which led to the omission of their names from the official list even though they did participate in the coronation.

Following the litany and the prayers, the king sat in a chair positioned in front of the archbishop. This chair was probably the one mentioned in the counter-roll - *ornatus . . . cathedre regis ante altare* -.

The ordo then directs the archbishop to tear the king's shirt open in preparation for the anointing. This direction conflicts with the opening rubric which provides for slits in the king's shirt fastened by buttons. This conflict re-occurs later in the ordo when the king's clothes are to be sewn up. Yet this contradiction does not invalidate the other rubrics; it simply means that it is not known whether the archbishop ripped open Edward III's shirt or merely undid the buttons.[54]

The anointing of the king was the most important and solemn part of the whole ceremony; it was through the unction that God's grace and favour were bestowed on the king. By it the king became God's elect; by it he became truly king, set apart from his subjects. As the oath incorporated the idea of contract between ruler and subject, so the unction exemplified the second principle seen in the coronation - that of theocratic kingship. It was in order to receive this special grace from God that the king's shirt was opened. The archbishop was then to anoint the king's hands while saying the prayer Ungantur. After this anointing an anthem was sung and another prayer recited. The chest, shoulders, and elbows of the king were next anointed de saint oyle. With this same oil the archbishop traced a cross on the king's forehead; he then repeated the action with chrism, a compound of olive oil and balsam, which was very holy and normally reserved only for the consecration of bishops. After this further anointing the prayer Deus dei filius was recited.[55]

A white coif was then put on the king's head to protect the unction and, according to this particular rubric, his shirt was sewn up. The coif and the shirt were to be worn for seven days, at the end of which time they were removed by the archbishop in a solemn ceremony.

Once the anointing was complete, the king received the regalia. It seems that certain items of the regalia, including some of the vestments, which are called St. Edward's, actually did belong to that monarch. When Henry III opened St. Edward's tomb in 1269 in order to translate the saint's relics, the Confessor's regalia was transferred to the abbey treasury and eventually used in Edward I's coronation.[56] The monks were naturally very anxious that these precious relics remain in their care. This particular ordo in manuscript A is very careful to point out where the various items used in the coronation came from - the abbey church at Westminster or the king's treasury. This concern certainly suggests that the ordo was a product of Westminster abbey, although other ordines from the abbey do not show this same concern.

First the king was clothed in un Tunycle de saint followed by les sudayrs and then the spurs; the tunycle and buskins were in the care of the monks while the spurs were in la purueance de Ministres du Roi. The king next received la cote Saint Edward and then the prayer Deus Rex Regum was recited.[57] The difficulty lies in determining to which vestments these French names refer. Dr. H. G. Richardson understandably identifies the tunycle as the supertunica and the cote as the colobium sindonis.[58] In other ordines, however, the colobium sindonis is put on first and then the supertunica - an order which is suggested by the sense of the word. Moreover, the manuscript painting attached to the ordo found in manuscript D shows, according to J. Wickham-Legg, the colobium as the first garment.[59] The only other possibility is that the order of robing was modified for Edward III's coronation.

Once the king had been robed, the archbishop was to bless the king's sword and say the prayer Exaudi. The king was then to take the sword which, as the ordo makes quite clear, was to symbolize that the king had the power to rule the whole kingdom, but only according to the stipulations of his oath. At the same time the archbishop pronounced the formula accipe gladium. The king was then girded with the sword.[60]

The next directions are interesting. The king was to take le cole, or stole as it is more usually called, a long strip of embroidered cloth with ribbons at each end which hung around the king's neck. The rubric, however, then directs the archbishop to say the formula accipe armillam. The ordo does not explain what an armillam is. Strictly speaking it is a bracelet. At one time the sacerdotal element of kingship had been represented by a bracelet. The stole, however, became the symbol of this element and thus became known as the armillam. In fact, as the following quotation from the Lytlington ordo, which is almost certainly the one followed at Richard II's coronation in 1377, makes clear, the stole was, in 1377 at any rate, like a bracelet.

> These armils shall hang like a stole round his neck, from both shoulders to the elbows, and shall be bound to the elbows by silken knots, as can be seen better by the form of the armils.[61]

After the stole, the king was clothed with the mantel or pallium which, since it came from the treasury of Westminster, was possibly part of St. Edward's regalia, and then the archbishop began the formula accipe pallium.[62] The pallium was a rectangular piece of cloth which was draped over the king's shoulders and its upper corners tied in front of his chest, much like an ecclesiatical cope.[63]

Following the delivery of the pallium, the crown was blessed with the prayer Deus tuorum. It was then sprinkled and censed by the archbishop. Finally, the crown was placed on the king's head while the prayer coronet te deus was recited. The only clue to the appearance of this crown comes from Edward's great seal which depicts him wearing a circlet with fleurons.[64]

The next item of the *regalia* which the king received was the ring. This rubric directs that

> *Apres suira la benizoun del anel, oue certayns oreisons, et si serra mys au doit nue, et puis les gauntz li serront mys, et pardesus lanel de Saint Edward*.[65]

A ring is first put on the king's *doit nue*. Next a pair of gloves are put on, followed by the ring of St. Edward which was placed on a gloved finger. Dr. H. G. Richardson has remarked that this is a most unusual and unique rubric and he wonders if in fact it was followed.[66] It seems clear that the gloves were not intended to protect the unction since the king wore a ring on his bare finger and, later at the banquet, he washed his hands. A pair of silk gloves is mentioned in the counter-roll as being purchased *pro rege in coronacione sua quando fuit consecratus*. Since there is no further mention of gloves in the *ordo*, these gloves were probably the ones worn by the king.[67]

Once the king had taken the ring, he was to offer on the altar the sword with which he had previously been girded. The leading earl was then to redeem this sword and carry it before himself. The money used to redeem the sword belonged to the altar.

The king next received the sceptre in his right hand and the virge, or rod of office, in his left. The archbishop repeated *accipe sceptrum* and *accipe virgam* at the appropriate moments.

At this point the king was to kiss the bishops while sitting in his chair - presumably the one in front of the altar. The bishops were then to lead the king honourably to his royal chair on the pulpit while chanting the anthem *te deum laudamus*. When the anthem was finished the archbishop was to recite the formula *sta et retine*. In the Lytlington *ordo* after the archbishop had finished, the nobles were to come to pay homage to the king.[68] Manuscript A, however, omits any mention of this most important ritual. It is inconceivable that Edward did not receive the homage due to him. The *Historia Roffensis* states, somewhat implausibly, that homage had been done much earlier, on 8 January.[69] However, the *Gesta Edwardi tertii* records that

> *Quem [Edward III] inunctum Walterus Cantuariensis archepiscopus, sicuti mos est, regni diademate insignavit. Cui omnes proceres terrae fidelitatem et homagium tunc fecerunt.*[70]

When the offertory had begun, the king was once again to approach the altar and present the oblation of bread and wine to the archbishop. Then he was to place his offering of a mark of gold on the altar and bow before it. The archbishop then said several prayers, after which the king returned to his chair on the pulpit where he was to remain during the singing of the *Agnus Dei* and the archbishop's solemn benediction of the king and the people. Once the singing of the mass had finished, the king again was to walk to the altar and there, if willing, he received communion in one kind.[72]

The final rubrics of the *ordo* concern the *regalia* of St. Edward. If the king wished to divest himself of them in the church, he was to return to the pulpit to do so; he would then receive other *regalia*, provided for him by his servants (*ses Ministres*). On the other hand, if the king retired to the palace wearing St. Edward's *regalia*, once he had removed them, they were to be returned to the abbey.[73] It is impossible to say which option Edward III followed. The counter-roll, however, does mention that a *cubiculum*, which was possibly the disrobing area, was prepared in the abbey.[74] After the ceremony in Westminster Abbey, the king returned to the palace in order to celebrate his coronation with a feast.

As Mr. L. G. Wickham-Legg has pointed out, the king had been fasting in preparation for his coronation, so, at the end of the ceremony, "his natural impulse would be to partake of breakfast."[75] Hence, it is likely that from the earliest times a meal followed the coronation ceremony. As the ordo of the coronation service became increasingly complex, so the meal also grew into the coronation banquet - a large and elaborate feast which required many special services.

As was customary, Edward III's banquet was held in the Great Hall of the palace of Westminster. At the far end of the Hall from the entrance was a small dais on which the king's table and his richly decorated chair were placed.[76] Unfortunately there is a dearth of information about Edward III's coronation banquet. However, the arrangements for Richard II's banquet found in the record of the Court of Claims are perhaps typical. Tables were arranged down both sides of the Hall.[77] At the first table on the king's right-hand side the barons of the Cinque Ports sat. The remaining tables on the right side were occupied by important officials of the Chancery and Exchequer, "and other honourable persons according to their estates." The officials of the city of London were seated at the first table on the left side. Below them sat "other honest men of the commonalty of the realm."[78] The arrangements for Edward III's banquet perhaps were similar.

This banquet naturally required that a number of jobs or services be performed. From the few pieces of evidence relating to these services some useful information about the banquet can be drawn. The Household Book of 1-2 Edward III contains a short and very incomplete list of the payments of fees to those who fulfilled various offices,[79] and the record of the Court of Claims for Richard II's coronation again has useful information.[80] Unfortunately our knowledge of Edward III's coronation banquet is largely limited to these services.

Once the king was seated at his table, he was presented with a basin of water and a towel so that he could wash. The right of serving the king with water originally belonged to the great chamberlain and he received for his fee the ewer, basin, and towels. This particular service, however, came to be regarded as separate from the office of chamberlain perhaps because, as Mr. J. H. Round has suggested, the actual service was performed in the hall which was outside the chamberlain's domain - the chamber.[81] In 1377 Robert de Vere, the earl of Oxford, petitioned the Court of Claims for the office of chamberlain on the grounds that his ancestors had fulfilled this office "from time immemorial." Yet he also presented a separate petition claiming, on the same grounds, the right to serve the king with water. Both claims were allowed.[82] Thus it is probable that Thomas de Vere, the earl of Oxford's son, who was acting as his father's deputy in the office of chamberlain, served Edward III with water.[83] Once the chamberlain had served the king, the basin and towel were held by the lord of the manor of Heydon in Cambridgeshire who received one of the towels as he fee.[84]

When the necessary preliminaries had been performed, the meal could begin. The organization of the kitchens and the presentation of the various courses was the responsibility of the steward of England, the Lord High Steward, whose office had developed from that of sewer. It was his privilege to serve the first course to the king. This office was hereditary to the earls of Leicester. This earldom, however, came to be held by the earls of Lancaster.[85] Consequently in 1327, Henry, earl of Lancaster, served as Steward of England. Definite proof of this assertion is provided by the Household Book which records that a large number of precious objects were apportabantur . . . per dominum comitem Lancastris nomine foedi senescalli Anglie die coronacionis Regis . . . .[86]

In the same fashion as the Steward was responsible for the food, so the Chief Butler was in charge of the drink which was served at the banquet. Likewise, he had the privilege of serving the king. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Robert de Mohaut probably served as Chief Butler.[87] He was assisted in his office by the mayor and citizens of London. Judging from the record of the coronation of queen Eleanor, Henry III's wife, in 1236, the mayor held the cup of wine until the Chief Butler was ready to serve the king. This same record also mentions that the mayor served "with three hundred and sixty cups."[88] Fortunately a petition made by the mayor of London found in the Rotuli Parliamentarum of 1337 elaborates this curious statement somewhat. It records that the mayors of London served in the Butlery "with 360 valets wearing the same livery, carrying in their hands a cup of white silver" as they had at previous coronations. The customary fee for this service, as the petition makes clear, was a gold cup with a cover and an enamelled gold ewer.[89] The Household Book of 1-2 Edward III records that a gold cup with a cover enamelled with the arms of England which Hugh Despenser the elder had given to Edward II worth £48 15 .s., and an enamelled gold ewer whose cover was ornamented with two perlis scotie worth £40 17 .s. 6 .d. were taken by Richard Bretoigne, the mayor of London, for his fee as Chief Butler.[90] Unfortunately this statement conflicts with evidence presented above which suggests that Robert de Mohaut was in fact the Chief Butler.[91] Perhaps the office was shared. It is clear that the mayor of London served in the butlery in 1327 and received a handsome fee worth £89 12 .s. 6 .d..

However, in 1337 the mayor submitted the above mentioned petition to parliament complaining that the sheriffs of London, on the order of the Exchequer, had distrained his property to the value of £89 12 .s. 6 .d. as repayment of his fee. He added that he would willingly pay if he was discharged from the service. The king responded by ordering the treasurer and barons of the Exchequer to search their records for information concerning this matter and to make restitution to the mayor, if previous mayors had received this fee for their service.[92]

Another officer who served at the banquet was the pantler. It was his duty to carry the salt-cellar, carving knives and spoons to the king's table and arrange them on it. After the banquet he was to receive the salt-cellar and knives as his fee.[93] In 1327 the pantler was Thomas le Wake, a firm Lancastrian.[94] We know from the Household Book that he received the salt-cellar - unum salare argentum deauratum per totum amellatum cum cooperculo.[95] No doubt he also took the knives.

One of the most famous of the services performed at the banquet was that of the king's champion. It was the champion's duty to enter the Great Hall and offer the challenge to "prove by his body, if necessary, against whomsoever that the king who is crowned . . . is the true and right heir of the kingdom." As Mr. J. H. Round has pointed out, this service ". . . was merely a survival of Anglo-Norman law. It was, in the highest sphere, . . . 'proof by battle'."[96] If anyone responded to the challenge, the champion retained the horse and arms which the king had lent him as his fee by right. Otherwise any fee he received was solely from the king's grace. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Henry Hillary was the king's champion in 1327 and he received the fee by the king's grace.[97]

Two of the less important banquet services were connected with the kitchen. The chief larderer was the person in charge of the larder where provisions were stored ready for use by the kitchen; he may also have taken some part in supplying these provisions. John Burdeleys was the chief larderer at Edward III's coronation banquet.[98] His service was probably strictly honorary, since, on the day of the coronation, the larder was undoubtedly a very busy place, requiring an experienced officer to run it smoothly. This qualification was probably also true of the office of chief usher of the larder and pantry which was held by John Daubeney.[99] The usher seems to have kept account of the goods leaving the larder and pantry.

If the record of Richard II's coronation is a reliable guide, after the banquet was finished, the king retired to his chamber and was served with a cup of wine; the remainder of the day was spent with his companions "in dancing, leaping, and solemn minstrelsy for joy . . . ."; then "the lord king and the others . . ., wearied with extreme toil, sought rest and slept."[100]

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. R. Barber, *The Knight and Chivalry* (London: Longmans, 1970), p. 41.

2. Ibid., p. 46.

3. Sir F. M. Powicke and E. B. Fryde, eds., *The Handbook of British Chronology*, 2nd. ed. (London: The Royal Historical Society, 1961), p. 35.

4. "Gesta Edwardi Tertii autore Bridlingtoniensi" in *Chronicles of the reigns of Edward I and II*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols. (London: 1882-1883), 2:95.

5. *Historia Anglicana of Thomas Walsingham*, 1:188.

6. See above, p. 43.

7. See above, p. 15.

8. Richardson and Sayles, "Early Coronation Records," 13 p. 137 n.3; J. W. Wickham-Legg, *Three Coronation Orders*, pp. 121-124.

9. Ibid., pp. 39-49; xxxii.

10. W. Maskell, *Monumenta ritualia ecclesiae anglicanae*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1882), 2:1-52.

11. Richardson and Sayles, "Early Coronation Records," *B.I.H.R.* 13 (1935-36); 129-145: 14 (1936-37): 1-9, 145-48; Bertie Wilkinson, "Notes on the Coronation Records of the Fourteenth Century," *English Historical Review* 70 (1955): 581-600; Richardson, "The Coronation in Medieval England," pp. 111-202.

12. Wilkinson, "Notes on the Coronation Records," p. 600.

13. Richardson and Sayles, "Early Coronation Records," 13 p. 137.

14. Ibid., p. 138.

15. Ibid., p. 147.

16. Wilkinson, "Notes on the Coronation Records," p. 591.

17. Ibid., p. 589.

18. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. xxxii.

19. In 1308 archbishop Winchelsey was unable to reach England in time for Edward II's coronation and a deputy had to be appointed. The accepted *ordo* of Edward II's coronation reflects this situation by naming the archbishop of Canterbury or his deputy as the officiant.

20. Wilkinson, "Notes on the Coronation Records," p. 587.

21. Ibid., p. 588, 589.

22. Ibid., p. 588, 590.

23. Ibid., p. 515.

24. The sermon in manuscript E is bracketed and the sermon from the Lytlington *ordo* is "written in the margin obviously as a substitute . . . . The evidence [of manuscript E] would strongly suggest that the Lytlington *ordo* was regarded as a modification of it, and was thus later in time." Wilkinson, "Notes on the Coronation Records," p. 596.

25. Ibid., p. 595, 593. For Dr. H. G. Richardson manuscript E also "seems to reflect the extraordinary circumstances of the accession of Edward III." He suggests, however, that it was a revision of the coronation office made a few years after 1327. See Richardson, "The Coronation in Medieval England." p. 150.

26. Wilkinson, "The Deposition of Richard II." p. 229.

27. Ibid., p. 597.

28. Richardson and Sayles, "Early Coronation Records," 14 p. 148.

29. Richardson and Sayles, "Early Coronation Records." 13 p. 139.

30. Richardson, "The Coronation in Medieval England," pp. 143-146.

31. J. Bruckmann, "The *Ordines* of the Third Recension of the Medieval English Coronation Order," in Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson, p. 113.

32. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 121.

33. It was the Chamberlain of England's duty to dress the king before the coronation and disrobe him after the ceremony. At one time this office had been hereditary; Henry I had granted it to Aubrey de Vere and his heirs. (J. H. Round, The King's Serjeants, pp. 121-122.) Later, however, there seems to have been some doubt as to who in fact held the

office. Robert de Vere, the sixth earl of Oxford, "tried repeatedly to recover the office of Chamberlain of England, but the claim was still pending at his death in 1331." He was certainly summoned to attend Edward II's coronation in 1308 and he may have acted as Chamberlain, although there is no explicit record of his having done so. (Cockayne, Complete Peerage, 10:220 n.c, 219.) But in 1327, the sixth earl probably did not discharge this office, because he was then seventy years old. (Powicke and Fryde, The Handbook of British Chronology, p. 443.) Judging from an entry in the Household Book of 1-2 Edward III, in 1327 the earl held the office but appointed his son as deputy. The entry refers to some precious objects which were apportabuntur per Thomum de Veur filium domini comitis oxoniensis nomine foedi camerarii die coronacionis domini Regis. Household Book fo. 20b.

34. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 121.

35. See above, p. 15.

36. See above, p. 36.

37. Richardson, "Early Coronation Records: The coronation of Edward II," p. 8.

38. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, pp. 121-122.

39. C. CL. R. 1327-1330, p. 100.

40. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, pp. 121-122. The barons of the Cinque Ports were to take the cloth as their fee, while the lances and bells went to the sacrist of Westminster.

41. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Record, pp. 83-85; Richardson, "Early Coronation Records: The coronation of Edward II," p. 8.

42. Foedera, 3:63.

43. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, pp. 48-49, 84.

44. The ordo in manuscript C does mention a service performed by four nobles, but it is a less comprehensive service than that described in manuscript A; the four nobles were simply to lead the king to the church; nor is the king directed to select the nobles. No other ordo mentions such a service. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 39.

45. Edwards, "The Political Importance of the English Bishops," pp. 336, 342.

46. Colvin, The History of the King's Works, 1:137.

47. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 122.

48. Ibid.; "Annales Paulini" in Chronicles of the reigns of Edward I and II, 1:324.

49. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 122.

50. Wilkinson, "Notes on the Coronation Records," p. 591.

51. C. CL. R. 1327-1330, p. 100.

52. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 122.

53. William Dene, "Historia Roffensis", 1:368.

54. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 122.

55. Ibid., pp. 122-123. The kings of France and England were the only monarchs of western Europe who received the chrism. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Record, pp. xxxiv-xxxv.

56. Zillah Halls, Coronation Costume and Accessories (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1978), pp. 7-8.

57. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 123.

58. Richardson, "The Coronation in Medieval England." p. 193. A colobium is usually considered to be a sleeveless garment, but in the painting attached to manuscript D it clearly has sleeves. Also, the description of the colobium in Lytlington ordo suggests that it has sleeves. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Record, p. xl.

59. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. xxxiii.

60. Ibid., p. 123.

61. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. 120. An inventory of the regalia made in 1356 records that there was "a stole of red samite garnished with emeralds and pearls with two pendants of gold garnished with stones" in the treasury in the Tower of London. This was probably the stole which Edward wore at his banquet, not the relic of St. Edward which he had received at the coronation and which remained in the care of the abbey. Ibid., pp. 79-80.

62. In the middle of the fifteenth century, a monk of Westminster by the name of Sporley made an inventory of the Confessor's regalia, which mention an embroidered pall. Ibid., pp. 191-192.

63. In the painting attached to manuscript D, a sexfoil golden brooch is used to fasten the pallium. The Household Book of 1-2 Edward III records that a golden brooch in sex dimidiis circulis garnished with precious stones was used for the

coronation and returned to the Tower of London immediately after the banquet. It was perhaps used to secure the pallium. Household Book, fo. 21.

64. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 123; L. G. English Coronation Records, p. xlv.

65. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 123.

66. Richardson, "The Coronation in Medieval England," p. 143.

67. However, the Lytlington ordo directs that a pair of gloves from the regalia were to be given to the king before he received the sceptre. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. 97.

68. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. 99.

69. See above, p. 11.

70. "Gesta Edwardi tertii autore Bridlingtoniensi," 2:95.

71. J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 123. If the coronation took place on a feast day, the mass for that particular feast would be sung. But if the king was crowned on an ordinary Sunday and the convent of the abbey had already sung the mass for that day, a special mass for the king was to be celebrated. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. 102.

72. Why the king received communion in one kind only is not specified. The Lytlington ordo directs that the king receive communion in two kinds. Ibid., p. 105: J. W. Wickham-Legg, Three Coronation Orders, p. 123.

73. Ibid., pp. 123-124.

74. See above, p. 40

75. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. lxiii.

76. In preparation for Edward I's coronation banquet, Master Robert de Beverley, the king's mason, was paid 50 "therewith to erect a stage for the feast of the king's coronation, thereon to be held." Devon, Issues of the Exchequer, p. 84.

77. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. 167.

78. Ibid.

79. Household Book, fos. 19-21.

80. See chapter two above for a discussion of the petition to perform services and of the preparations which were made for the

banquet. For the text of the Court of Claims held prior to Richard II's coronation see L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, pp. 131-168.

81. Round, The King's Serjeants, p. 117.

82. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, pp. 152-153.

83. Mr. J. H. Round has found in the Inquisitiones post mortem of 12 Edward III that Robert de Newburgh held the manor of Winfrith in Dorset "by service of giving the king water on his coronation day, receiving the basin and ewer as his fee." An earlier description of this serjeanty in Testa, however, mentions that the fee was not received if the earl of Oxford was present. It would seem that the lords of Winfirth might act as deputies of the earls for this service. Round, The King's Serjeants, p. 124. See above, n.33.

84. A John Wiltshire of London who held Heydon manor presented a petition to hold the basin and towel at the Court of Claims in 1377. His petition was allowed but the service was actually performed by the earl of Cambridge acting as his deputy. Perhaps the situation in 1327 was similar. (L.G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. 153), The serjeanty has been examined in great detail by Mr. J. H. Round in his book The King's Serjeants, pp. 125-32.

85. Ibid., pp. 69-76.

86. Household Book, fo. 20b. Thirty-five items were taken by the earl of Lancaster.

87. See above, pp. 28-29.

88. Michael Belet in fact assisted the Chief Butler in 1236, but the mayor of London later enforced his own claims to this office. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. 63.

89. Rotuli Parliamentorum, 6 vols. ed. by J. Strachey, J. Pridden, E. Upham (London, 1783), 2:96.

90. Household Book, fo. 21a.

91. See above, pp. 28-29.

92. Rotuli Parliamentorum, 2:96.

93. Mr. J. H. Round gives a rather dubious description of the pantler's duties drawn from a record of the archbishop of York's enthronization banquet in 1465. (Round, The King's Serjeants, pp. 211-13.) In 1377 the pantler, the earl of Warwick, claimed the spoons as well. A search of the records for evidence supporting this claim was inconclusive, but the king did eventually allow it. (L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, p. 145.).

94. Household Book, fo. 19a. He was the earl of Lancaster's son-in-law and he had been very vocal in demanding Edward II's removal in the January assembly. He later fled the country because of his part in the murder of Robert Holland, the man who had betrayed Thomas of Lancaster in 1322.

95. Ibid. This salt-cellar originally belonged to the earl of Arundel, who had been an adherent of Edward II.

96. Round, The King's Serjeants, pp. 379-80.

97. For five years the accounts of the keeper of the Wardrobe, Robert de Wodehouse, were not accepted by the Exchequer auditors. According to T. F. Tout, "a chief reason seems to have been that Wodehouse could not explain the disappearance of a large amount of plate, taken away from the coronation feast by the great lords, like the hereditary steward and chamberlain,'in the name of their fee'." It would seem that some of the lords took advantage of the uncertainty about who ruled, the council or Isabella and Mortimer, and appropriated various precious objects. Wodehouse eventually burdened himself with these missing items, but Tout feels that, since Wodehouse was now the treasurer of the Exchequer, "this obligation was only a matter of book-keeping readjustment." Tout, Chapters, 4:94n.4.

98. See above, p. 30.

99. See above, pp. 30-31.

100. L. G. Wickham-Legg, English Coronation Records, pp. 158-59, 168.

CONCLUSION

This study of Edward III's coronation in 1327 raises some interesting points about the political situation at that time.

During the last months of 1326, Edward II's rule collapsed. The main reason for the swiftness of Edward II's downfall was the lack of support he received. Only a few of the bishops supported him, notably the bishops of London, Carlisle and Rochester, and the archbishop of York. The names of all these bishops were omitted from the official list of those who attended the coronation, even though at least two of them, the bishops of London and Rochester, were present and indeed participated in the service. Also, it is hard to suppose that the bishop of Carlisle and the archbishop of York, who were definitely in London during the weeks immediately prior to the coronation, did not attend such an important ceremony. The reason for these omissions can only be guessed - perhaps it was simply spitefulness. For reasons of propaganda it would have been more sensible to have included them. The success of the rebellion perhaps allowed the rebels to disregard such considerations.

The rebels who ousted Edward II were far from united. They formed an uneasy union of several different elements, each with its own aims and aspirations. It seems possible that, given subsequent events, Isabella and Mortimer had planned from the beginning of the invasion to remove Edward II and rule England through his son, Edward III. The members of the Lancastrian faction and other Contrariants, on the other hand, wanted to regain their lost lands and titles and to remove the Despensers. The prospect of Isabella and Mortimer as the powers behind the throne would no doubt have alarmed many of them. There was, moreover, no obvious leader whom all would follow. Undoubtedly, however, the influence of Isabella, the queen of England and the mother of the heir-apparent, and through her of Mortimer, was paramount. Nevertheless, Mortimer probably played a less public role than might have been expected since he would not have been acceptable as a leader to Henry earl of Leicester, the head of the Lancastrian faction and the most powerful magnate in England. Certainly Mortimer played no public role in Edward III's coronation, unlike that of Edward II at which he helped to carry the regalia from the palace to the abbey church. Isabella and Mortimer, perhaps remembering the offence caused by Gaveston at Edward II's coronation, though it politic for Mortimer not to be conspicuous at Edward III's coronation, lest he too provoke the leading magnates. Thus Henry of Leicester was able to enjoy unchallenged the position of importance at the coronation which was his by right of being the Lord High Steward of England.[1] However, Mortimer's true position, which he held by virtue of his relationship with Isabella, is shown by the fact that three of his sons were knighted alongside Edward III - a great honour.

Edward III's knighting, although it alone required a great deal of preparation, was only a part of the celebrations which took place on 1 February 1327, each element of which also demanded extensive arrangements. The enormous amount of preparation necessary for a coronation meant that arrangements for Edward III's coronation must have begun long before the throne was vacant - a point which suggests that the rebels' plans to remove Edward II, as opposed to simply destroying the Despensers, were formulated fairly soon after they landed, certainly no later than 16 November when Edward II was apprehended. Faced as the rebels were with the drastic step of removing a king, Edward II, they would have wanted to install his successor in the traditional fashion and with as much pomp and magnificence as possible so as to give an air of legitimacy to the succession and to impress the people with the splendour of the new regime. And certainly the money was available for such a coronation. But even though the need for a coronation was seen early, the preparations for it were still extremely rushed. So, inevitably, the coronation was a compromise between the shortage of time and the need for a splendid ceremony and banquet. The banquet in fact was probably the most impressive part of the coronation, partly because it was perhaps easiest to organize.

The details of Edward III's coronation, to which Joshua Barnes slightingly referred as "matters of less moment", are not unimportant.[2] They can illuminate and reflect the political situation in which the coronation took place. Furthermore, details of a coronation are intrinsically important for, as P. E. Schramm notes, "The consecration of [a] monarch is one of the most magnificent and most genuine products of the medieval spirit, and for this reason it is worthwhile attempting to grasp its minutest details."[3]

FOOTNOTES TO CONCLUSION

1. In 1377 John of Gaunt, the earl of Lancaster and Leicester and the Lord High Steward of England, was in charge of the preparations for Richard II's coronation. Perhaps Henry of Leicester had a similar responsiblity in 1327. There is, however, no firm evidence which suggest this.

2. See above, p. n.

3. Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation*, p. 10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Sources

Public Record Office, Exchequer Accounts Various, E 101/383/6.

Public Record Office, Exchequer Accounts Various, E 101/383/8.

Published Sources

"Annales monasterii de Bermundeseia: in *Annales Monastici*, vol. 3. ed. Henry Richard Luard. Rolls Series, London, 1868.

"Annales monasterii de Osenia" in *Annales Monastici*, vol. 4. ed. Henry Richard Luard. Rolls Series, London, 1869.

"Annales Paulini" in *Chronicles of the reigns of Edward I and Edward II*. vol. 1. ed. W. Stubbs. Rolls Series, London, 1882.

"Annales prioratus de Dunstapalia" in *Annales Monastici*. vol. 3. ed. Henry Richard Luard. Rolls Series, London, 1868.

Calendar of Close Rolls, 1323-27; 1327-30.

Calendar of Fine Rolls, 1319-27.

Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1324-27; 1327-30.

Chronicle of England of John Capgrave. ed. F. C. Hingeston. Rolls Series, London, 1858.

Chronicle of Lanercost 1272-1346. translated by Herbert Maxwell. Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1913.

Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynbroke. ed. E. M. Thompson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889.

Chronicon Henrici Knighton. vol. 1. ed. J. R. Lumby. Rolls Series, London, 1889.

Chronicon monasterii de Melsa, vol. 2. ed. Edward A. Bond. Rolls Series, London, 1867.

Continuatio Chronicarum of Adam Murimuth. ed. E. M. Thompson. Rolls Series, London, 1889.

"De Gestis Edwardi tertii of Robert of Avebury" in Continuatio Chronicarum of Adam Murimuth. ed. E. M. Thompson. Rolls Series, London, 1889.

English Coronation Records. ed. L. G. Wickham-Legg. Westminster: Archibald Constable & Co., 1901.

Eulogium. Chronicon usque a.d. 1366. vol. 3. ed. F. S. Haydon. Rolls Series, London, 1863.

Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae, et Cuiuscunque Generis Acta Publica. ed. T. Rymer 7 vols. London: Record Commission, 1816-69.

"Gesta Edwardi tertii autore canonico Bridlingtoniensi" in Chronicles of the reigns of Edward I and Edward II. vol. 2. ed. W. Stubbs. Rolls Series, London, 1883.

Historia Anglicana of Thomas Walsingham. vol. 1. ed. H. T. Riley. Rolls Series, London, 1863.

"Historia Roffensis of William Dene" in Anglia Sacra. vol. 1. ed. H. Wharton. London, 1691.

The Household Book of Queen Isabella of England for the Fifth Regnal Year of Edward II 8 July 1311 to 7 July 1312. ed. F. D. Blackley and G. Hermansen. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 1971.

Issues of the Exchequer Henry III - Henry VI. ed. Fredrick Devon. London: Record Commission, 1837.

McMurchy, J. "The Coronation and Churching of Queen Philippa in the Fourth Year of the Reign of Edward III of England, Including an Unpublished Great Wardrobe Indenture Relating to these Occasions." M.A. thesis, University of Alberta, 1976.

Malcolm, J. "Two Wardrobe Books of Thomas of Brotherton and Edmund of Woodstock." M.A. thesis, University of Alberta, 1965.

Polychronicon of Ranulph Higden. vol. 8. ed. J. R. Lumby. Rolls Series, London, 1882.

Rotuli Parliamentorum. ed. J. Strachey, J. Pridden, Ed. Upham. 6 vols. London, 1767.

The Scalacronica of Sir Thomas Gray. translated by Herbert Maxwell. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons, 1907.

Select Documents of English Constitutional History, 1307-1485. ed. S. B. Chrimes and A. L. Brown. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1961.

Three Coronation Orders. ed. J. W. Wickham-Legg. Henry Bradshaw Society Publications vol. 19. 1900.

"Vita Edwardi secundi autore Malmesberiensi" in Chronicles of the reigns of Edward I and Edward II. vol. 2. ed. W. Stubbs. Rolls Series, London, 1883.

Secondary Works

Barber, Richard. The Knight and Chivalry. London: Longman Group, 1970; Sphere Books, 1974.

Barnes, J. History of Edward III. Cambrige, 1688.

Blackley, F. D. "Isabella and the bishop of Exeter" in Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson. ed. M. R. Powicke and T. A. Sandquist, pp. 220-35. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Bond, E. A. "Extracts from the Liberate Rolls, relative to loans supplied by Italian merchants to the Kings of England, in the 13th and 14th centuries." Archaeologia 28 (1840): pp. 207-326.

Bruckmann, J. "The Ordines of the Third Recension of the Medieval English Coronation Order" in Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson. ed. M. R. Powicke and T. A. Sandquist, pp. 99-115. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Clarke, M. V. "Committees of Estates and the Deposition of Edward II." in Medieval Representation and Consent. pp. 173-95. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1936

Cockayne, G. E. Complete Peerage. rev. edition 13 vols. ed. Vicary Givvs et al. London: St. Catherine Press, 1910-40.

Colvin, H. M., gen. ed. The History of the King's Works. 3 vols. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1963.

Denhom-Young, N. Handwriting in England and Wales. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1954.

Du Cange. Glossarium mediae et inimae Latinitatis. Paris: Didot Fratres, 1840.

Edwards, J. G. "The Personnel of the Commons in Parliament under Edward I and Edward II." in Historical Studies of the English Parliaments. 2 vols. ed. E. B. Fryde and E. Miller, 1:150-67 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Edwards, K. "The Political Importance of the English Bishops during the reign of Edward II." English Historical Review 49 (1944): 311-47

Fryde, E. B. "Materials for the Study of Edward III's credit operations 1327-48." Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 22 (1949): 105-38; 23 (1950): 1-30.

Fryde, Natalie M. "John Stratford, bishop of Winchester, and the crown." Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 44 (1971): 153-61.

_______. The tyranny and fall of Edward II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Gooder, E. Latin for Local Historians. 2nd, ed. London: Longman Group, 1978.

Gray, H. L. "The Production and Exportation of English Woollens in the Fourteenth Century." English Historical Review 39 (1924): 13-35.

Haines, Roy Martin. The Church and Politics in Fourteenth Century England: the career of Adam Orleton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1978.

Halls, Zillah. Coronation Costume and Accessories. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1973.

Hoyt, Robert S. "The Coronation Oath of 1308." Traditio 11 (1955): 235-57.

Johnson, J. H. "The System of Account in the Wardrobe of Edward II." Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 4th. ser. 12 (1929): 75-104.

_______. "The King's Wardrobe and Household." in The English Government at Work, 1327-36. 3 vols. ed. J. F. Willard and W. A. Morris. vol. 1. Central and Prerogative Administration, pp. 206-49. Cambridge Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1940.

Johnson, Paul. The Life and Times of Edward III. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.

Jones, W. Crowns and Coronations. London: Chatto and Windus, 1902; reprint ed., Detroit, Michigan: Singing Tree Press, 1968.

Latham, R. E. Revised Medieval Latin Word-List. London: Published for the British Academy by the Oxford University Press, 1973.

McKisack, May. The Fourteenth Century. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Nevinson, J. L. "Civil Costume" in Medieval England. vol. 1. 2nd edition, ed. A. L. Poole. pp. 300-313. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Nicolas, N. Harris. "Expenses of the Great Wardrobe of Edward III from 29 September 1344 to 1 August 1345, 21 December 1345 to 31 January 1349." Archaelogia 31 (1845): 5-103.

Powicke F. M. and Fryde, E. B., eds. The Handbook of British Chronology. 2nd, ed. London: The Royal Historical Society, 1961.

Richardson, H. G. "The Coronation of Edward I," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 15 (1937-38): 94-99.

_______. "Early Coronation Records, the coronation of Edward II." Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 16 (1938-89): 1-11.

_______. "The English Coronation Oath." Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 4th. ser. 23 (1941): 129-58.

_______. "The English Coronation Oath." Speculum 24 (1949): 44-75

_______. "The Coronation in Medieval England: the Evolution of the Office and the Oath." Traditio 16 (1960): 111-202.

Richardson, H. G. and Sayles, G. O. "Early Coronation Records." Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 13 (1935-36): 129-45; 14 (1936-37): 1-9, 145-48.

Round, J. H. The King's Serjeants and Officers of State. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1911; reprint ed. London: Tabard Press, 1970.

Russell, E. "The Societies of the Bardi and Peruzzi and their dealings with Edward III." in Finance and Trade under Edward III. ed. George Unwin, pp. 93-135. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1918; reprint ed., London: Frank Cass & Co., 1962.

Safford, E. W. "An Account of the Expenses of Eleanor, sister of Edward III, on the occasion of her marriage to Reynald, Count of Guelders." Archaelogia 77 (1927): 111-40.

Schramm, Percy Ernst. A History of the English Coronation. translated by L. G. Wickham-Legg. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.

Tanner, L. E. The History of the Coronation. London: Pitkin, 1952.

Tout, T. F. Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England. 6 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1920-37.

Ullmann, Walter. A History of Political Thought: the Middle Ages. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penquin Books, 1965.

Warburton, W. Edward III. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1902.

Ward, P. L. "The Coronation Ceremony in Medieval England." Speculum 14 (1939): 160-78.

Wilkinson, Bertie. "The Deposition of Richard II and the Accession of Henry IV." English Historical Review 54 (1939): 215-239.

_______. The Coronation in History. London: The Historical Association, 1953.

_______. "Notes on the Coronation Records of the Fourteenth Century." *English Historical Review* 70 (1955): 582-600.

_______. *Constitutional History of Medieval England, 1216-1399*. 3 vols. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1958.

_______. *The Later Middle Ages in England*. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1969.

Williams, Gwyn. *Medieval London: from Commune to Capital*. London: Athlone press, 1963.

APPENDIX I

Invaluable information about the preparations for Edward III's coronation is found in the Great Wardrobe counter-roll of John de Feryby, PRO Exchequer Accounts Various, E. 101/383/6, which records "various things purchased and used" for that occasion in Westminster Abbey and the palace at Westminster. This counter-roll was a duplicate of a roll prepared by Thomas de Useflete, clerk of the Great Wardrobe, which does not seem to have survived.[1]

The heading of the counter-roll states that John de Feryby was deputed "by king and council" especially to keep this counter-roll of coronation expenses, presumably in order to keep these special expenses distinct from the normal expenses of the Great Wardrobe. Since the Ordinance of Westminster in 1324, the Great Wardrobe had accounted directly to the Exchequer; so, at the annual Exchequer audit, both the roll and counter-roll would have been presented, one as a check against the other.[2] Audit notations customarily would have been marked only on the roll, and none appears on the counter-roll.

The counter-roll is divided into two parts: the first lists the various types of material bought, along with the name of the seller, the price, and the date and place of purchase; the second records how material from the Great Wardrobe was used in the decoration of the abbey and palace.[3] Not all of the material purchased was used, and some of the material used is not listed as having been purchased for the coronation.

For example, the first part of the counter-roll records that thirty-five ells of *taffata* costing £2 15 .s. 4 ,d. and thirty-two pieces of *cindo de Triple* worth £26 1 .s. 6 .d. were purchased. Neither type of cloth appears in the second part of the counter-roll. On the other hand, the *cubiculum* in the abbey was decorated with *samitello paleato de Styne*, a cloth which, according to the first part of the counter-roll, was not purchased by the Great Wardrobe for the coronation. *Pannus ad aurum in serico de Turk', pannus tartarei radiati*, and plain canvas were also used but, again, apparently not purchased specifically for the coronation.

The amount of cloth purchased for the coronation far exceeds the amount that was in fact used. Twenty-nine *panni ad aurum in serico de Nakta* worth £98 10 .s. were bought but only two were used. Out of eleven *panni ad aurum in serico raffata* purchased at a cost of £30 10 .s., only one was used. The only exception to this discrepancy between the amount bought and those used, is cloth *de Candlewykstret'* - of 1128 ells which were purchased, 952 were used.

This method of recording accounts seems strange to modern practice, but is was a very simple procedure. The Great Wardrobe had to account at the Exchequer both for money spent and also for its inventory of supplies. Hence the counter-roll had to show the amount of cloth purchased, its cost, and how much of it was used. Thus the Exchequer could be satisfied concerning the Great Wardrobe's expenditures; and its inventory of Great Wardrobe supplies, which would have been on hand from the last audit, could be brought up to date - the inventory would be reduced by the items issued and increased by those which were purchased but not used.

Nevertheless, it is still somewhat odd that so much of the cloth listed as purchased in the counter-roll was not used. Perhaps the officials of the Great Wardrobe were uncertain about what supplies would be needed and, in the haste with which the preparations for the coronation were made, they simply bought whatever supplies were available of various types of cloth. Undoubtedly they knew that the young king's wedding, which would require a lot of cloth, was in the offing and thus any cloth extra from the coronation would not be wasted. On the other hand, it is possible that some of the cloth purchased was used for coronation purposes other than the decoration of the abbey and palace, the documentation of which remains to be discovered. It is hard to imagine that none of the cloth recorded in the first part of the counter-roll was used for robes for the king and others.

The date of purchase of some of the cloths also raises a problem. Twenty-one of the entries of purchase are dated after the coronation: the balance are dated mense ianuarii. Perhaps the purchases dated after the coronation were received by the Great Wardrobe before that event, but payment was not made to the merchants until some months later. The reason for this late payment can only be conjectured. The government certainly had an ample supply of money on hand but medieval governments were notoriously slow in paying their debts. The Great Wardrobe itself may have experienced some minor difficulties in obtaining all the cash it needed. The late payments amounted to only £282 17 .s. 10 .d. out of a total of £1003 10 .s. 7 .d.. All of the merchants who received late payment had received prompt payment for other cloth purchased from them by the Great Wardrobe.

It would be useful to know how much the cloth used to decorate the palace and abbey cost, but this figure cannot be calculated accurately. Although the second part of the counter-roll specifies what cloth was used, and how, it does not record the value of the cloth and it does not identify the merchants from whom the cloth was purchased. Even when the type of cloth mentioned in the second part of the counter-roll is listed in the first part, there are still problems. The price of a particular type of cloth was by no means uniform. It varied depending on the quality of the cloth and the merchant from whom it was purchased. For example,

> *Hugoni de Garton mercenario London' pro .xxviii. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' precii panni .liii.s.iii.d. et .xxiiii. pannis ad aurum in serico consimiles [sic] precii cuiuslibet .xl.s.*
>
> *Predicto Thome Godchep pro .v. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' precii panni .xxx.s. . . . .*

Medieval measures add a further complication. In the first part of the roll *ueluetum* is recorded as being purchased either in ells or *pecie*, but the purple velvet used to decorate the abbey chancel is given in the second part as a cloth or *pannus*. A 'piece' could contain nine ells, thirteen ells, eighteen ells, or seven and one-quarter ells.

Yet even if an exact calculation is not possible, a rough figure can be estimated. If one uses an average price for the various types of cloth recorded in the first part of the counter-roll, the figure of £187 is arrived at as the total cost of the cloth used to decorate the abbey church and palace. Of course the value cloths which appear only in the second part must also be added to this figure. At most these cloths were worth £40 for only a very small amount of costly material and some 300 ells of plain canvas fall into this category. Thus the maximum cost of cloth decorations for the palace and abbey was some £230. This very approximate figure is only useful in that it suggests that not a great deal of money was spent for decorative purposes.

The counter-roll contains only one minor error in calculation. According to the third entry of the sub-section headed *cindo affortiatus* John Perers supplied the Great Wardrobe with a number of variously coloured pieces of *cindo* worth, according to the figures given in the entry, £9 14 .s. 4 .d.. However, he was paid only £9 6 .s. 8 .d.. Given the difficulty of working with medieval figures, it is surprising that more mistakes were not made.

The roll and counter-roll were not submitted at the Exchequer until 9 July 1330. The Exchequer's accounting procedures were equally slow, for it was not until two years later that some irregularities in the accounts of the clerk of the Great Wardrobe were challenged.[4]

The counter-roll is written in a diminutive court hand which is clear and legible, except for one brief section on the dorse of the first membrance which is extremely faded and difficult to read. The same handwriting appears throughout, save for the few faded lines which are possibly by another hand.

Although there are numerous abbreviations in the document most of them are standard and can be extended easily. However, it was found impossible to extend a number of words, mostly of a descriptive nature, relating to cloth. There is no satisfactory dictionary for the various forms of medieval cloth to assist the student. One assumes, from the price, that cloth of Candlewykstret' was a popular, cheap variety, and that all cloths of gold were luxury items, but one can only guess at what distinguished one type of cloth of gold from another. Yet in each case, the general meaning of such words is clear enough from the context of their use in the counter-roll.

FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX I

1. John de Feryby began his service in the king's Household in the early part of Edward II's reign. (J. H. Johnson, "The king's Wardrobe and Household," in *The English Government at Work*, 1327-1336, 3 vols. eds. J. F. Willard and W. A. Morris Cambridge Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1940: 2:241). Thomas de Useflete had been appointed keeper of the Great Wardrobe on 26 August 1323. Tout, *Chapters*, 6:35.

2. S. B. Chrimes, *An Introduction to the Administrative History of Medieval England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952), pp. 181-83. From the Household Ordinance of 1297 to the reorganization of 1324, an official of the Household, the clerk of the spicery, was the controller of the Great Wardrobe. This office lapsed with the reform. John de Feryby, who was a clerk of the privy seal, was appointed controller "by the king and council" on an *ad hoc* basis only for coronation expenses. Tout, *Chapters*, 4:100 n.3, 386.

3. Other than cloth, only a pair of silk gloves appears in the counter-roll. The gloves were purchased for and used at the coronation.

4. When the clerk of the Great Wardrobe presented his account in 1332, the officials of the Exchequer questioned the entries which allowed the monks of Westminster to retain the various hangings, cloths, and cushions used to decorated the abbey church. The monks eventually appealed their claim to the king who, on this occasion, upheld the claim. Richardson, "The Coronation in Medieval England," p. 128 n. 13.

APPENDIX II

E 101/383/6

Contrarotulus Iohannis de Feryby contrarotulatoris Thome de Useflete clerici magne garderobe regis per eundem regem et consilium deputati de diuersis rebus emptis et expensis circa coronacionem dicti domini regis Edwardi tercii a conquestu in ecclesia beati Petri Westmonaster' et in palacio eiusdem uidelicet primo die februarii anno regni sui primo ut patet infra.

Nakta[1]

Iohanni de Perers mercenario London' pro .iii. pannis ad aurum in serico de Nakta precii panni .iiii. li. emptis ab eo London' mense ianuarii anno presenti - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - .xii. li.

Iohanni Somer pro .x. pannis ad aurum in serico de Nakta precii panni .iiii. li. emptis ab eo ibidem - - - - - - - - - .xl. li.

Iacobo Nicholas mercatori de societate Bardorum pro .xiiii. pannis ad aurum in serico de Nakta precii panni .lv. s. emptis ab eo London' eodem mense - .xxxviii. li. x. s.

Hugoni de Garton pro .ii. pannis ad aurum in serico de Nakta precii panni .iiii. li. emptis ab eo ibidem anno eodem - - - - - - .viii. li.

Summa .xxix. panni[2]

Raffata - - Summa .xi. panni[3]

Predicto Iohanni de Perers pro .xi. pannis ad aurum in serico raffata precii panni .lx. s. emptis ab eo London' predicto mense ianuarii anno eodem - .xxxiii. li.

Summa .cxxxi. li. x. s.[4]

Diaspinet'[5]

Hugoni de Garton mercenario London' pro .xxviii. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' precii panni .liii. s. iiii. d. et .xxiiii. pannis ad aurum in serico consimiles [sic] precii panni .xxx. s. emptis ab eo London' dicto mense ianuarii anno presenti - - - - .cx. li. xiii. s. iiii. s.

Predicto Iohanni Somer pro .xiiii. pannis ad aurum in serico bondato diaspinet' precii cuiuslibet .lx. s. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense anno eodem - .xlii. li.

Predicto Iohanni Perers pro .xi. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' precii cuiuslibet .xl. s. emptis ab eo ibidem mense et anno predictis - - - .xxii. li.

Nicholao de Causton mercenario London' pro .ii. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' bondato precii panni .liii. s. iiii. d. et .v. pannis ad aurum diaspinett' precii panni .xxxiii. s. iiii. d. emptis ab eo ibidem predicto mense ianuarii anno presenti - - - - .xiii. li. xiii. s. iiii. d.

Predicto Thome Godchep pro .v. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' precii panni .xxx. s. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense ianuarii anno presenti - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - .vii. li. x. s.

Predicto Simoni Fraunceys pro .v. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' bondato precii panni .liii. s. iiii. d. emptis ab eo London' predicto mense ianuarii anno presenti - - - - - - - - - - .xiii. li. vi. s. viii. d.

Eidem Simoni pro .xi. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' bondato precii panni .xl. s. et .xi. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' precii cuiuslibet .xxx. s. emptis ab eo London' predicto mense ianuarii anno eodem - .xxxviii. li. x. s.

Eidem Simoni pro .xi. pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' precii panni

.xl. s. emptis ab eo ibidem mense nouembris anno eodem - - - .xx. li.

Summa .cxxvi. panni

Summa .cclxvii. li. xiii. s. iiii. d.

Aurum in canabo

Predicto Hugoni de Garton pro .xxxi. pannis ad aurum in canabo precii panni .xv. s. et .xxvi. pannis consimilibus[6] precii panni .xiii. s. emptis ab eo London' predicto mense ianuarii anno presenti - - - - .xl. li. iii. s.

Predicto Nicholao de Causton pro .iiii. pannis ad aurum in canabo precii panni .xv. s. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense - - - - - .lx. s.

Predicto Thome Godchep pro .xii. pannis ad aurum in canabo precii panni .xii. s. emptis ab eo London' predicto mense ianuarii dicto anno primo - .vii. li. iiii. s.

Predicto Simoni Fraunceys pro .xii. pannis ad aurum in canabo precii panni .xii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense ianuarii - - - - .vii. li. xiiii. s.[7]

Summa .$\overset{xx}{\text{iiii}}$.v. panni

Summa .lvii. li. xi. s.

Ueluetum

Predicto Iohanni de Perers pro .iii. peciis ueluetí purpurei precii pecie .lx. s. emptis ab eo London' predicto mense ianuarii anno presenti - .ix. li.

Eidem pro .iii. ulnis uelueti purpurei precii ulne .vii. s. vi. d. .iii. ulnis uelueti rubei precii ulne .xiiii. s. .vi. ulnis dimidia uelueti rubei precii ulne .xiii. s. iiii. d. et .iiii. ulnis uelueti glaucei precii ulne .v. s. emptis ab eo ibidem - - - - - .viii. li. xi. s. ii. d.

Predicto Thome Godchep pro .iii. ulnis uelueti uioleti precii ulne .xv. s.

et .iii. quarteriis unius ulne precii .viii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - .liii. s.

Predicto Hugoni de Garton pro .ix. ulnis et .iii. quarteriis uelueti rubei et uiridi precii ulne .xiii. s. iiii. d. emptis ab eo ibidem mense marcii anno eodem - - - - - - - - - - - - - .vi. li. x. s.

Predicto Simoni Fraunceys pro .v. peciis uelueti murrei precii pecie .xl. s. .v. ulnis .iii. quarteriis et dimidia uelueti rubei precii ulne .xii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem mense decembris - - - - - .xiii. li. x. s. vi. d.

Antonino Bathe alienigene pro .iiii. peciis uelueti purpurei precii pecie .xxxvi. s. emptis ab eo ibidem dicto mense decembris anno eodem - .vii. li. iiii. s.

Predicto Iacobo Nicholas pro .iiii. peciis uelueti purpurei precii pecie .xxxvi. s. emptis ab eo ibidem dicto mense decembris - - - .vii. li. iiii. s.

Predicto Iohanni de Walmesford pro .iii. peciis uelueti rubei precii pecie .xl. s. .iiii. ulnis uelueti uiridi precii ulne .vi. s. viii. d. emptis ab eo apud Eboracum mense ianuarii anno eodem - - - - - .vii. li. vi. s. viii. d.

Summa .xix. pecie .xxxix. ulne .iii. quarteria dimidia

Summa .lxi. li. xix. s. iiii. d.

Samitellus

Predicto Simoni Fraunceys pro .iiii. peciis dimidia samitelli rubei uiridi et Tul' precii pecie .liii. s. iiii. d. .vi. peciis samitelli nigri et .iiii. peciis samitelli albi precii pecie .xl. s. emptis ab eo London' per uices hoc anno - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - .xxxii. li.

Predicto Hugoni de Garton pro .ix. ulnis samitelli rubei et uiridi precii ulne .v. s. vi. d. emptis ab eo London' mense maii anno presenti - .xlix. s. vi. d.

Prefato Iohanni Perers pro .iiii. ulnis dimidia samitelli yndi precii ulne

.v. s. vi. d. emptis ab eo London' predicto mense maii anno eodem - .xxiiii. s. ix. d.

Predicto Iohanni Somer pro dimidia ulna et dimidia quarterio samitelli yndi precii - - - - - - - - - - - - .iiii. s. ii. d.

Summa .xiiii. pecie dimidia .xiiii. ulne dimidia quarterium pecie continentes .vi. ulnas dimidiam

Summa .xxxv. li. xviii. s. v. d.

Camaca

Predicto Iohanni de Perers pro .xii. pannis de camaca precii panni .xliii. s. iiii. d. emptis ab eo London' mense ianuarii hoc anno - - - - .xxvi. li.

Summa .xii. panni quolibet continenti .viii. ulnas

Summa .xxvi. li.

Tarsensis

Predicto Hugoni de Garton pro .vi. pannis de Tarsensi precii panni .xl. s. .viii. ulnis consimilis panni precii ulne .iii. s. iiii. d. emptis ab eo ibidem dicto mense ianuarii anno eodem - - - - - .xiii. li. vi. s. viii. d.

Eidem pro .iiii. ulnis Tarsensis precii ulne .iii. s. vi. d. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense - - - - - - - - - - - .xiiii. s.

Predicto Simoni Fraunceys pro .ii. peciis panni de Tarsensi precii panni .xlv. s. .i. panno precii .xlii. s. .vi. pannis consimilibus precii panni .xl. s. .viii. ulnis dimidia panni Tarsensis precii ulne .iii. s. iiii. d. emptis ab eo London' per uices - - - - - - - - .xx. li. iiii. d.

Predicto Iohanni de Perers pro .ii. pannis de Tarsensi precii panni .l. s. .viii. ulnis .iii. quarteriis consimilis panni precii ulne .iiii. s. .x. ulnis consimilis panni precii ulne .iii. s. x. d. .xxvi. ulnis dimidia precii ulne .iii. s. vi. d. emptis ab eo ibidem mense ianuarii anno presenti - .xiii. li. vi. s. i. d.

Theobaldo de Causton pro .i. panno purpureo de Tarsensi precii .xliii. s. iiii. d. et .ii. ulnis dimidia panni consimilis precii ulne .ii. s. iiii. d. emptis . . .[9] ab eo ibidem mense decembris hoc anno - - - .li. s. viii. d.

Bonocorpori Barbar' pro .iii. pannis Tarsensis precii panni .xxxviii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem mense ianuarii anno eodem - - - - .cxiiii. s.

Predicto Thome Godchep pro .i. panno Tarsensis precii .l. s. emptis ab eo ibidem mense ianuarii hoc anno - - - - - - - - - .l. s.

Summa .xxii. panni .lxviii. ulne .i. quarterium pecie continentes .xiii. ulnas

Summa .lviii. li. ii. s. ix. d.

Taffata

Predicto Iohanni Perers pro .xix. ulnis panni de Taffata precii ulne .ii. s. emptis ab eo London' mense ianuarii anno eodem - - - - .xxxviii. s.

Iohanni de Herewardstok pro .xiii. ulnis panni taffate precii ulne .xvi. d. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense - - - - .xvii. s. iiii. d.

Summa .xxxii. ulne

Summa .lv. s. iiii. d.

Cindo de Triple

Predicto Simoni Fraunceys pro .iiii. peciis cindonis rubei et uiridi de Triple precii pecie .xviii. s. et .i. pecia consimilis cindonis precii ulne .ii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem mense ianuarii anno presenti - - - - .iiii. li. ix. s.

Predicto Hugoni de Garton pro .vi. peciis cindonis rubei de Triple precii pecie .xvi. s. .iiii. ulnis .i. quarterio consimilis cindonis precii ulne

.ii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem mense marcii anno eodem - - - .ciiii. s. vi. d.

Predicto Thome Godchep pro .xii. peciis cindonis yndi et uiridi de Triple precii pecie .xvi. s. emptis ab eo dicto mense marcii anno eodem - .ix. li. xii. s.

Predicto Iohanni Perers pro .viii. peciis et dimidia cindonis de Triple precii pecie .xvi. s. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense - - - .vi. li. xvi. s.

Summa .xxxi. pecie dimidia .iiii. ulne .i. quarterium pecie continentes .ix. ulnas

Summa .xxvi. li. xviii. d.

Cirotece de serico

Predicto Hugoni de Garton pro .i. pari cirotecis de serico empto pro rege contra coronacionem mense ianuarii precii - - - - .iii. s.

Summa li. par cirotece

Summa .iii. s.

Cindo affortiatus

Predicto Thome Godchep pro .vii. peciis cindonis viridi affortiati precii pecie .xv. s. vi. d. .xiii. peciis cindonis rubei affortiati .v. peciis dimidia cindonis uiridi et .x. peciis dimidia cindonis glaucei precii pecie .xv. s. emptis ab eo London' mense februarii anno presenti - .xxvii. li. iii. s. vi. d.

Antolino [sic] Bathe pro .xv. peciis cindonis rubei precii pecie .xiiii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem predicto mense decembris anno eodem - - - - .x. li. x. s.

Predicto Iohanni de Pers [sic] pro .iii. peciis cindonis glaucei precii pecie .xiiii. s. .vii. peciis cindonis affortiati albi precii pecie .xiii. s. viii. d. .iii. peciis cindonis rubei et glaucei precii pecie .xiii. s. et .xii. ulnis cindonis glaucei precii ulne .x. d. emptis ab eo London' mense marcii anno presenti - - - - - - - - - - - .ix. li. vi. s. viii. d.

Predicto Simoni Fraunceys pro .iii. peciis cindonis rubei affortiati precii pecie .xv. s. .lvi. peciis cindonis diuersi coloris precii pecie .xiiii. s. .xxxiii. peciis consimilis cindonis [precii] pecie .xiii. s. iiii. d. emptis ab eo per uices hoc anno - - - - - - - - - .lxiii. li. ix. s.

Predicto Hugoni de Garton pro .ix. peciis dimidia cindonis yndi affortiati precii pecie .xiiii. s. vi. d. emptis ab eo ibidem predicto mense marcii anno eodem - - - - - - - - - - - - - .vi. li. xvii. s. ix. d.

Predicto Theobaldo de Causton pro .ii. peciis cindonis glaucei precii pecie .xiiii. s. vi. d. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense - - - - - - .xxix. s.

Summa .clxvii. pecie dimidia .xii. ulne pecie continentes .xviii. ulnas

Summa .cxviii. li. xv. s. xi. d.

Summa empcionis panni ad aurum Tarsensis et cindonis .Dcc.iiii^{xx}.vi. li. x. s. vii. d.

m. 2

Tapetum

Predicto Iohanni Somer pro .viii. tapetis precii tapeti .xx. s. .xii. tapetis precii tapeti .xviii. x. ix. d. et .viii. tapetis diuersi coloris precii tapeti .xvii. s. vi. d. emptis ab eo London' mense ianuarii anno presenti - .xxvi. li. vi. s.

Predicto Iohanni Perers pro .xx. tapetis precii tapeti .xx. s. et .xvi. tapetis precii cuiuslibet .xviii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense - .xxxiiii. li. viii. s.

Predicto Hugoni de Garton pro .viii. tapetis precii tapeti .xvi. s. iii. d. et .xvi. tapetis precii tapeti .xvi. s. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense anno presenti - .xix. li. vi. s.

Predicto Simoni Fraunceys pro .xxxii. tapetis diuersi coloris precii tapeti

.xvi. s. .ii. bankeriis precii pecie .xxiiii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem eodem mense anno eodem - - - - - - - - - - .xxviii. li.

Predicto Nicholao de Causton pro .vi. tapetis precii tapeti[10] .xvi. s. vi. d. emptis ibidem de eodem predicto mense ianuarii anno presenti - .iiii. li. xix. s.

Predicto Iohanni de Causton pro .iiii. tapetis rubeis .iiii. tapetis uiridis et .iiii. tapetis yndis quolibet continenti .xvi. ulnas .i. quarteriam quadrat'[11] precii ulne .ii. s. et .xii. bankeriis de eisdem coloribus quolibet bankerio continenti .xii. ulnas quadrat' precii ulne .ii. s. emptis ab eo ibidem mense iunii anno presenti - - - - - .xxxiii. li. xviii. s.

Predicto Antonino [sic] Bache pro .iiii. tapetis yndis precii tapeti .x. s. vi. d. emptis ab eo ibidem mense nouembris anno eodem - - - - .xlii. s.

Predicto Thome Godchep pro .iiii. tapetis precii tapeti .xi. s. viii. d. emptis ab eo ibidem predicto mense nouembris anno presenti - .xlvi. s. viii. d.

Summa .cxlvi. tapeta

Summa .cli. li. iiii. s. viii. d.

Pannus de Candlewikstret'

Iuonio de Wynton mercatori London' pro .xxviii. pannis de Candlewykstret' precii panni .xlvi. s. viii. d. panno continenti .xl. ulnas[12] et pro .viii. ulnis consimilis panni precii ulne .xiii. d. emptis ab eo London' mense ianuarii anno presenti - - - - - - - - .lxv. li. xv. s. iiii. d.

Summa .xxviii. panni et .viii. ulne

Summa totalis empcionis - - - - - - .$\overset{l}{\mathrm{M}}$. iii. li. x. s. vii. d.

Pro Magna Aula Westmonaster' [et] pedibus regis et hala ibidem

De pannis de Candlewykstret' ad dorsora et bankera pro magna aula regis de Westmonaster' die coronacionis regis eodem anno primo - .vii. panni et .xii. ulne

Eodem die pro halis regis ibidem de panno consimili - - - - .lx. ulne

Eodem die ad ponendum sub pedibus regis nudus [sic] pedes [sic] transeuntis [sic] die coronacionis regis uidelicet a l'cto[13] suo usque ecclesiam et de ecclesia usque cameram regis post coronacionem redeuntis de consimili panno - .xv. panni

Eodem die pro guteriis halarum de canabo - - - .ccc. ulne centena per .$\overset{xx}{\text{vi}}$. et ulna per .v. quarteria[14]

Ornatus pulpituli regis die coronacionis sue in ecclesia Westmonaster'

Item in apparatu et ornamento pulpituli regis Edwardi tercii a conquestu die coronacionis ipsius regis in ecclesia Westmonasterii primo die februarii anno regni sui primo. Uidelicet de pannis ad aurum in serico optimis diaspinet' pannis ad aurum in canabo samitelli uelueti Tarsensis tapeti cum quissinis de camaca ut patet infra circa eundem pulpitulum appositis dicto die coronacionis regis Edwardi predicti per uisum et testimonium Iohannis de Feriby clerici ad hoc per senescallum et thesaurarium hospicii regis deputati pro plauncheriis eiusdem pulpituli in eadem ecclesia ubique cooperiendis de tapetis diuersi coloris - - - - - - - - .xxi. tapeta

Eodem die de pannis ad aurum in serico ad pendendendum [sic] circa eundem pulpitulum super latera bordera ex utraque parte et pro sede regis ornando in eodem pulpitulo de pannis supradictis - - - - .vi. panni .i. quarterio

Eodem die ad tendendum in alto supra caput regis sedentis in cathedra facta in eodem pulpitulo cum cordis de pannis ad aurum in canabo purpureis - - -

- .ii. panni

Eodem die de quissinis de camaca ad ponendum sub rege et pedibus suis in eadem cathedra - .v. quissina

Eodem die ad pendendum inter predictos pannos ad aurum in serico circa predictum pulpitulum super latera et bordera ut predicitur ex utraque parte de pannis ad aurum in canabo - - - - - - .xxii. panni

Item de pannis tartarei radiati ad idem - - - - - .i. pannus

Eodem die ad idem de cindoni affortiato - - - - - - .vi. pecie

Ornatus cancelli magni altaris et pauimenti dicte ecclesie die coronacionis

Item eodem die pro apparatu et ornamento magni altaris cancelli et pauimento eiusdem de pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' - - - - .iiii. panni

Eodem die ad idem de pannis uelueti purpurei - - - - - - .i. pannus

Eodem die de pannis in serico tartareo ad idem - - - - - .i. pannus

Ornatus cubiculi regis in consecracione sua cum oblacione eiusdem et cathedre regis ante altare[15]

Item eodem die in apparatu et ornamento cubiculi regis et pro parua cathedra regis cooperienda coram altare de pannis ad aurum de Nakta - - - .ii. panni

m. 3

Eodem die de pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' optimis ad idem - .ii. panni

Eodem die ad idem de samitello paleato de Styne - - - - .i. pannus

Eodem die de quissinis de camaca pro predicto cubiculo regis - .iiii. quissina

Item de quissinis de camaca pro parua cathedra regis - - - .iii. quissina

De cirotecis de serico pro rege in coronacione sua quando fuit consecratus - .i. par cirotece

Predicto domino regi pro oblacione sua de pannis ad aurum in serico diaspinet' optimis - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - .i. pannus

Ornatus cathedre Archiepiscopi Cantuar' ante altare

Item in apparatu et ornamento cathedre Archiepiscopi Cantuar' coram altare in qua sedebat in consecracione regis de pannis ad aurum in serico raffata - .i. pannus

Eodem die de quissinis de camaca pro eadem cathedra - - - .ii. quissina

Eodem die de tapetis ad ponendum sub dicta cathedra - - - .ii. tapeta

Pro tumba regis Edwardi defuncti cooperienda predicto die coronacionis in ecclesia predicta

Eodem die pro tumba domini Edwardi Aui illustris regis Edwardi tercii a conquestu in sollempnitate predicte coronacionis sue cooperienda de pannis ad aurum in serico optimis diaspinet' simul consuturis propter latitudinem dicte tumbe - .ii. panni

Coopertura quissina

Item de pannis de Tarsensi pro .iii. quissinis abbatis Westmonaster' de nouo cooperiendo ad ponendum sub pedibus regis descendendi de magna cathedra in pulpitulo post quam fuit unctus die coronacionis predicte in ecclesia predicta - .i. ulna dimidia

Ornatus camere regis ante miliciam regis

Item in apparatu et ornamento camere regis in nocte antequam suscepisset ordinem militaris uidelicet in palacio suo apud Westmonasterium ultimo die ianuarii anno eodem de tapetis rubeis cum scutis in corneris de armis regis - .v. tapeta

Eodem die de quissinis de samitello nouo pro capella regis - - - .iii. quissina

De quissinis samitelli pro eadem camera post miliciam[16] regis - .vi. quissina

De bankeriis pro eadem camera ornanda de diuersis sect'[17] uidelicet .iiii. rubei cum listis viridibus .i. viridi et .iiii. murrei et blueti - .ix. bankeria

Item de bankeriis pro predicta camera ornanda de secta predictorum tapetorum cum scutis in corneris de armis regis - - - - - - .iii. bankeria

Ornatus sedis regis in magna aula Westmonaster' die coronacionis regis

Item in ornamento sedis regis pro sessione sua in magna aula Westmonaster' predicto primo die februarii in coronacione sua uidelicet de pannis ad aurum in serico de Turk' ad dorsoriam pro eadem sede - - - - - - .iiii. panni continentes .xxx. ulnas .iii. quarterias

Eodem die pro eisdem dorsoriis saluandis ab humiditate murorum de canabo - .xxiiii. ulne

Eodem die pro celura ultra regem sedentum in eadem sede facienda de pannis ad aurum in canabo - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - .xii. panni

Eodem die ad .i. uolettum pro eadem celura dicte sedis in eadem aula faciendum cum labellis pendentibus ante mensam regis in sessione sua de cindoni rubeo et glauceo affortiato - - - - - - - - - - - .iiii. pecie

Eodem die ad ponendum sub rege eidem sessioni de uelueto - - - - .ii. pecie continentes .xiiii. ulnas dimidiam

Eodem die de quissinis samitelli ad idem - - - - - - - - - .iii. quissinis

m. l d.

Hanc rotulum continentum tres pecias liberauit ad scaccarium hic .ix. die iulii anno regis Edwardi tercii post conquestum quarto Iohannes de Feriby contrarotulator Thome de Usseflet custodi magne garderobe regis de missis custubus et expensis per ipsum factis in palacio et ecclesia Westmonaster' circa coronacionem regis anno regni sui primo. Et prestitit sacrum quod particule in eodem rotulo contente bene et fideliter apposite fuerunt.

FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX II

1. The section headings are bracketted to the left margin.

2. Unless otherwise indicated, the total amount of cloth purchased in each section is written in the left margin towards the end of the section.

3. In this particular case, the total of the cloth purchased appears directly after the section heading in the left margin. The word *raffata* appears in no Latin dictionary or word-list, hence its meaning is unknown. It is perhaps an adjective modifying *serico*, but if so, the ending is, of course, incorrect.

4. Unless otherwise indicated, the total amount of money spent in each section is bracketted to the right margin. This particular total is for the two sections, *Nakta* and *Raffata*.

5. It is impossible to describe this cloth beyond noting that it was a good quality cloth-of-gold. An entry in R. E. Latham's *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List* may relate to this cloth. - *pannus diaspinet'* 1358 'spinet', cloth made at Spinney, Cambridgeshire. (p. 448 - under the heading *spina*). I have not been able to find any information concerning the manufacture of cloth at Spinney.

6. *cons' ms*.

7. The total £7 14 .s. is obviously a mistake; it should be only £7 4 .s.. The mistake, however, does not show up in the total

8. *cons' ms*.

9. *lacuna* of about three letters *ms*.

10. *tapeti* above the line *ms*.

11. The basic meaning of *quadrat'* is square or fourfold. However, its meaning in this context is unclear. If the cost *per* ell is worked out, it is clear that *quadrat'* is not some sort of linear measurement; it is presumably an adjective modifying *ulnas*. In the *ms*. the word is unique to this entry.

12. *panno continenti .xl. ulnas* above the line *ms*.

Q

13. *a l'cto ms*. *Lecto* is simply a reasonable guess.

14. This line presented a certain amount of difficulty. In the ms *centena* is abbreviated c^a. I take this line to mean that there were 300 ells, one of which was a 'long hundred' of 120 ells (.$\overset{\text{xx}}{\text{vi}}$.) and that there was an ell containing five quarters.

15. This heading appears in the left margin in m. 3, but the section actually begins in m. 2.

16. *pro* is erased in *ms*.

17. This word is possibly the past passive participle of *seco*, *cui*, *ctus*, are meaning to cut. Hence *sect'* could mean cuttings or strips.